

THE Catholic Mind

VOL. L

JUNE, 1952

NO. 1074

Konrad Adenauer

ANDREW BOYLE

*Reprinted from COLUMBIA**

"SOME are born great," said Shakespeare through the mouth of the worldly-wise Malvolio, "some achieve greatness, and some have greatness thrust upon them." So far as that judgment applies to men of politics, it can be said of Dr. Konrad Adenauer, Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Western Germany, and one of the West's shrewdest and most farsighted leaders, that such greatness as he has achieved in his three brief years of power was accidentally thrust upon him at the beginning. For no political "success story" has had a stranger or less auspicious start than that of this 76-year-old Catholic statesman who is today one of the strong pillars of the skeleton structure of the new Europe.

Only four years ago, in 1948, the

name of Konrad Adenauer was not considered meritorious or well-known enough for inclusion in the German "Who's Who." He was remembered by people inside and outside of his homeland more for his work as Lord Mayor of the city of Cologne than for his potential talent as a future Chancellor. Indeed, that potential talent might never have been given the chance to develop if a somewhat obstreperous British official had not fired him!

The decision of this unknown Military Government representative to dismiss Dr. Adenauer from the Cologne City Hall appeared to be a harsh way of dealing with an old man of 70. In actual fact it forced him into national politics, and led to the discovery of a new star in

* Box 7, New Haven, Conn., March, 1952.

the overcast international sky. The reason given for his dismissal was "failing to display sufficient initiative and energy." That charge could hardly be made against his conduct of affairs since, as the head of the West German Republic.

It was, nevertheless, an unpleasant experience to be sacked from the post which he had held from the first World War to the rise of Hitler. As Cologne's Lord Mayor, Adenauer gave the city its University, its surrounding green belt, its annual trade fair, the first "autobahn," and a new bridge across the Rhine. The Americans reinstated him in 1945, and after five months his pride took a knock when the British removed him. The incident left a nasty impression on his mind which, happily, has been effaced by his recent visit to London.

Under Hitler, Dr. Adenauer had an unblemished record of calm, dignified resistance to the regime. He would not compromise his principles. He refused to collaborate, although the Nazis wished to benefit by his administrative experience. He was arrested and imprisoned three times, for inevitably the police regarded him with unmitigated suspicion. On the other hand, despite his position as one of the principal organizers of the old Catholic Center Party, he was not a big enough figure to be liquidated as a warning to others.

Like saintliness, statemanship is

a quality which can more easily be discerned than defined. The very complexity of modern democratic society spawns politicians by the shoal; and it offers opportunities of acquiring fame or notoriety that multiply not only with the number and variety of the problems they are called upon to tackle but through the magnifying and distorting processes of present-day publicity methods.

QUIET WORKER

It would be wrong to suggest that Dr. Adenauer shirks the publicity spotlight; he values the power of public opinion too much for that. But it would be right to assume that he is fundamentally a person who does not depend, as do so many top-ranking political figures, on the acclaim of the press and on the flattery or even the whole-hearted loyalty of his followers. He invites respect rather than popular affection. For he has been too long in the political wilderness to have time or patience for the useful but strictly non-essential art of playing to the gallery. Other statesmen, like Mr. Winston Churchill, who were possibly "born to greatness," are undoubtedly more subtle and ingenious in their handling and shaping of momentous events. But Dr. Adenauer's record of uphill achievement is proof enough of his astonishing patience, determination, dexterity and vision.

I was able to catch a fleeting

glimpse of those statesmanlike qualities in him when he visited London shortly before Christmas. Both in private and in public, in ordinary conversation and in his prepared speeches, he impressed me by his ability to reach and grasp the core of intricate questions without fuss or hesitation. His sincerity is of the unspectacular, unemotional sort. There are no theatrical gestures, no high-flown sentiments, none of those rounded oratorical flourishes which are even the moderately successful politician's stock-in-trade. On the contrary, he is quiet and rather matter-of-fact in manner; but his sense of humor, his keen intelligence and his idealism shine through and give unexpected meaning to the most prosaic of his statements.

The lofty brow and receding hair, the high cheek-bones under intent dark eyes that seem to look straight through you, lend Dr. Adenauer a faintly Oriental appearance. He is stylish and even elegant in bearing. Where a Truman might bound like an antelope, or a Churchill lumber like a bear, Adenauer moves with the grace of an Eastern Archimandrite. Yet his personal charm is as unforced as his natural dignity. His set features, and the deep lines bitten round his mouth, from nose to chin,

by suffering and the acid of time, will relax suddenly into a broad smile as he slips away from a "difficult" or impertinent question with a neat, verbal side-step. He is not the man to be surprised or angered into uttering political indiscretions. He is not the man, either, to avoid stating plain facts as he sees them, at the risk of hurting the delicate feelings of his listeners. But he will choose his own moment to do so. For there are one or two ideals to attain which he is prepared to sacrifice the leisure and energy of his remaining years. Of these unquestionably the greatest is his ideal of restoring Germany to her rightful place as a member of the European family of nations.

He had a good deal to say on this subject to me and to others. At Number Ten Downing Street, during his talks with the Prime Minister of Britain and his Cabinet colleagues, the Chancellor explained at length the trials and uncertainties of his self-appointed task as the man who is teaching the people of Western Germany to think as Europeans rather than as nationalists. He assessed the chances of success, weighing the intractable opposition of the Social Democrats, under the jaundiced but formidable leadership of Kurt Schumacher, against the en-

thusiasm of his own Christian Democrat supporters. Nor did he omit what appeared to him as one of the most hopeful auguries of all—the genuine zeal for his United Europe ideal of tens of thousands of young Germans, many of them university students.

MORAL COURAGE

Dr. Adenauer's most striking characteristic is his moral courage, which frequently takes the form in ordinary speech of a curiously Anglo-Saxon and un-Germanic disregard for the obstacles towering between himself and a given goal. I wondered at first whether he was merely striving to give a good impression to those he met, trusting perhaps that if he put the best possible face on his troubles the British Government and press would more readily acknowledge what he had achieved since assuming office. I soon learnt that such a naive interpretation of his motives was not only untrue but quite unworthy of the man. His unpretentious optimism, as I discovered, springs from two sources: a sure grasp of history, which prevents him from losing his sense of proportion in the day-to-day hurly-burly of politics; and an unusual personal ability to apply Christian principles to anything he undertakes.

I am not foolishly implying that there is necessarily an element of sanctity in his statemanship. If

there is, it is certainly not within the province of the political analyst to discover or describe it. I do believe, however, that in Konrad Adenauer of Germany, as in Robert Schuman of France, the Catholic Faith which both share has helped to sharpen and clarify a common understanding of the social and political disorders of crippled, uneasy postwar Europe.

It is much more than a coincidence that these two men were brought together for the first time four years ago at an informal conference organized by the "*nouvelles équipes internationales*"—a loose association of Christian Democrats from several European countries who meet regularly to exchange information and discuss solutions to complex social and political problems. Nor is it surprising that general ideas and principles, which were later to be moulded into the practical form of the world-famous Schuman Plan, were threshed out originally in these unrecorded meetings of Catholic politicians. The mutual liking and esteem which has grown up between the Foreign Minister of France and the Federal Chancellor of Germany is based on something more than similarity of temperament and outlook. It is also based on the knowledge that each, in broadly the same way, is striving to translate into action measures that will systematically restore the unity of the once-Christian

West by reconciling France and Germany.

SCHUMAN'S FAITH AND REALISM

At Strasbourg, in the grim summer of 1950, when the Korean conflict was plunging the Western nations into a gloomy sense of foreboding, I met M. Schuman in the lobbies of the Council of Europe building. At a time when both politicians and public were mainly concerned with the dangers of a sudden Soviet blow against the almost non-existent defences of the West, he had just delivered a calm and lucid exposé of his proposals for pooling the coal and steel output of Europe. It seemed an uncommonly bad occasion for rousing interest in a project which belonged to an uncertain future. But it was typical of Schuman's faith and realism that he should have defied the prophets of woe to outline his revolutionary scheme for merging the war-making industries of France and Germany, thus removing the economic means of exploiting political differences. I remember asking him to what extent Catholic social principles underlay his plan. And I shall never forget his reply:

It goes without saying that the underlying principles are Christian principles. European peace through economic unity and prosperity is the goal; this project with its conditions of common sacrifice is the road to it. . . . I can't say with certainty which particular movements or persons indirectly steered me

at one time or another. But what can be said in general with absolute truth is that the so-called Schuman Plan represents the flowering of the intense social movement which was the work of Continental Catholics between the two world wars.

One of those Catholics was, of course, Konrad Adenauer, an obscure if competent member of the Catholic Center Party in Germany before the rise of Hitler. Even in the full tide of the Nazi flood, when everything he cherished and stood for seemed doomed, he never lost his bearings or his historical perspective. And so, when he in turn allowed me to hurl questions at him recently, I had already decided to test him on the same broad terrain as I had tested M. Schuman. For though it is an irresistible temptation for the ordinary run of politicians to pay lip service to lofty ideals in the interests of self-advertisement, I was reasonably certain that Dr. Adenauer's stature as a statesman would forbid him to stoop to such transparent devices. In any case I was well aware that in asking him to sum up his hopes and misgivings as to progress in the current negotiations on the Schuman Plan and the European Army, I was drawing him out on two related topics very close to his heart. He replied:

These projects are not simply ends in themselves. They are also means to the positive end of a new, unified Europe from which fear, ambition and

jealousy will have been banished. The goal of a European family, which will be the trustee and guardian of our common Christian civilization, is now within reach. We cannot afford to let slip the present opportunity of attaining it. For we may not get another opportunity like it.

CHRISTIAN STATESMAN

In my role of Devil's Advocate, I pressed him further. "You may believe this very strongly," I said. "But do the leaders of the other countries taking part in the negotiations see the matter in the same clear light?" He replied without hesitation: "I know that they share the same view to a greater or lesser degree. There are points of difference and friction; but they're largely technical. With a little patience and a spirit of compromise, we shall have complete agreement." He continued:

I have been questioned several times about the feeling of other Germans. Outsiders seem to doubt sometimes whether our people are ready to honor the far-reaching arrangements that are being worked out in their name. I am often asked if they really believe in the European idea, and if they can be relied on to live up to that idea. I want to give an assurance that most of them can, and do, and will.

These were stirring words, coming from a man whose Coalition Government at Bonn has a bare working majority to endorse his major policies. They were as much an act of faith as the words of M. Schuman at Strasbourg two and a half years

before. They brought out most vividly the characteristic attitude of a real Christian statesman, who refuses to be downcast or distracted by immediate difficulties. If his eyes are fixed on a seemingly remote goal, his feet are firmly on the ground. And with his fellow-statesman across the Rhine inspired by the same tangible vision, Dr. Adenauer's task is appreciably lightened.

Bearing in mind his humiliating experience at the hands of the British Occupation authorities, I saw in his completely objective regard for Britain's "isolationist" attitude to European unity yet another proof of his essential greatness. The latest session of the Council of Europe had just ended, and politicians from more than a dozen countries had returned to their capitals ranting and raving against "perfidious Albion." Less than two months previously, the return to power in Britain of Mr. Churchill's Conservative Government had sent a flood of hope surging across the Continent. The architect of their liberation from wartime captivity, the originator of the entire postwar movement of European unity, the man who had first propounded the idea of a European Army from his place in the Strasbourg Assembly had become Prime Minister again. Millions of people naturally assumed that now the full weight of Mr. Churchill's authority and prestige would make itself felt

in the efforts to create a viable international organization, the foundations of which were already laid in the Schuman and Plevén Plans. The presence at Strasbourg of a representative group of United States Congressmen seemed to provide the perfect setting for a sudden historic change-for-the-better in the political set-up of the Old World.

The mood of disillusionment which followed, when official British spokesmen broke the incredible news that Mr. Churchill's Government was no more prepared to sacrifice national sovereignty than its Socialist predecessor, was bitter and tense. It was as though Mr. Churchill had been caught in the act of placing a time-bomb under the very edifice he had formerly struggled hard to construct; and the chorus of shocked criticism reverberated round every European capital. The Prime Minister's legendary reputation slumped badly as a result; and it was while the storm of abuse was at its height that Dr. Adenauer—the one Western leader who stood to lose most by Britain's apparent defection—visited him in London.

CHURCHILL'S ASSURANCE

Mr. Churchill, who did not once speak out publicly in support of his Government's stand at Strasbourg, assured the Federal Chancellor that he had nothing to fear. There was no change of heart or change of front

in London. It was simply that Britain, with her Commonwealth commitments, had broader responsibilities to fulfil. She would honor her obligations as a partner in the Western defence forces under General Eisenhower's command, and she would do everything possible to speed the formation of the European Army and the inauguration of the Schuman Plan. Nevertheless, no useful purpose would be served by merging her troops with those of France, Germany, Italy and the Benelux countries, or by entering the coal-steel pool at the moment.

Now the illuminating point is that Dr. Adenauer needed no reassurance whatever about the reasons for Britain's policy. Even though he was shortly to confront the Lower House of the German Parliament in a fateful debate on the Plevén Plan, he did not allow premonitions or tactical troubles to weaken his detached appreciation of Britain's course. The Chancellor's historical sense of perspective had again prevailed in framing his judgment of an immediate, if difficult, dilemma. As it happened, he returned soon afterwards to Germany, overrode all opposition and secured the requisite parliamentary vote in favor of the European Army project early in January. Before leaving for home he said to me:

It would have been easier for us all if Britain were a partner in the European defense community. But even with

Britain outside, there is no reason why the European Army project should collapse. The British—from my reading of history—always take a different attitude to plans as opposed to facts. Once the defense community is set up, I am sure that close relations with Britain will automatically follow.

It is a rare gift in any statesman to know exactly from one moment to the next how much room for manoeuvre your political foes and the pressure of outside events have left you. That gift Dr. Adenauer possesses to a marked degree. He is too old and wise to care much for the limelight; but he is rarely off the front-pages of the European press. He may have a very narrow margin of support in the Bonn Parliament; but he chooses to lead a sometimes reluctant public opinion, rather than be led by it. He is anxious always to please his friends and allies; but he is too honest not to tell them when they hurt him by trampling on the interests of his own people.

In Dr. Konrad Adenauer, the Western half of Germany has a leader who may prove irreplaceable. His advanced age is more to be regretted and feared than the enmity of his political foes. Britain, the United States and the entire West should not underestimate his immense value as an astute political leader who is also a great European. As an eminent critic on this side of the Atlantic said of him recently: "Germany may be the land which takes least account of its political prophets. Western civilization, however, should pay him more fitting tribute for the way in which he has tided his country over some of the most difficult years of its existence. For it may be reasonable to think that Germany is still a political volcano, quiescent but not extinct. And Dr. Adenauer is the man who, sitting at the top, has prevented anyone from dropping lighted matches down its crater."

The volcano is still under control.



Adult Education

The apostolate of adult education has been proclaimed by authoritative Catholic voices, and we may hope that gradually, yet not too slowly, there will be appropriate and adequate action. Catholics may not be able to make up lost ground if they wait to be forced into imitative counter-action of non-Catholic agencies. If others are the pioneers on this new social frontier, they will occupy the strategic positions and set the patterns; late-comers will have to take the lower places and fit themselves to patterns which they would not prefer if they had the initiative.—*Henry Somerville in CANADIAN MESSENGER OF THE SACRED HEART, January, 1952.*

Our Growing Population

JAMES VIZZARD, S.J.
Georgetown University

*Reprinted from SOCIAL ORDER**

"PEOPLE are funny!" might well be something more than the title of a radio program. It could also be the conclusion of those scientific specialists who attempt to chart and forecast the trends of human behavior. The unpredictable antics of the radio participants have brought laughs to millions; the same millions, however, as subjects of various forecasts, have brought only headaches to the experts.

Gallup and Roper, as well as a legion of less scientific prognosticators, can testify to that. Nothing more than loud groans have been heard from them since Truman upset their statistical appercart. That particular debacle made history.

New history, apparently read from the same script, is being made today. It is being spelled out in the 1950 population data now being released by the Census Bureau. The effect of the presidential election of 1948 on political forecasters is being repeated in the impact of the 1950 Census on

population experts. Once again the proof is all too evident that the most laboriously and scientifically prepared forecasts may be betrayed by the one element that cannot be weighed in the statistical scales: the free act of the human will.

The fact is that the Census has uncovered a number of population developments which, while surprising to the layman, are stunning to the professional demographer.

By all odds, the most significant development has been the over-all increase in population. In the Census month of April, 1950, there were 150,500,000 people within the continental United States.¹ That total represents a gain of 19,000,000 over the 1940 Census, the largest 10-year increase on record; more than the total U. S. population in 1840.

Unlike earlier decades when the rate of increase was greater, this 1940-1950 growth owed little to immigration. It came from a combination of two factors: advances in medi-

¹ Less than three months later (July 1) the Census Bureau had to increase this count by half a million. The total reached 152,000,000 before the end of the year.

* 3115 South Grand Blvd., St. Louis 18, Mo., September, 1951.

cal science, which brought healthier and longer life, and the unprecedented flood of new births—32,000,000 in the decade.

Concealed within these aggregate statistics are three other surprising population movements of great importance. The *drift away from farming* is highlighted by the revelation that only four States, all predominantly rural, showed a net 10-year loss: North Dakota, Oklahoma, Arkansas and Mississippi; and this despite increases in the population of their individual cities. At least ten other agricultural States of the Midwest and South showed less than average increases.

INTERNAL MIGRATION

Surprising also has been the extent of *migration* into the West and Southwest. California alone, with her more than three and one-half million gain, accounted for almost one-fifth of the total U. S. increase. Texas added a million and a quarter, while Washington, Oregon, Nevada, Arizona, Utah and New Mexico all made gains far above average.

The third noteworthy development has been the booming of the *suburbs*. While most big cities showed less increase than expected, their environs mushroomed into spacious residential districts. The nation's twelve largest

metropolitan areas accounted for 35 per cent of the 10-year nationwide gain; but of this growth 72 per cent was *outside* the city limits.

All these statistics add up to a population revolution. In order to appreciate what a shocking surprise it has been to the population experts, one has only to examine their published expectations.

For more than two decades demographers have held that if anything was clear about U. S. population trends, it was the imminence of a stabilized or even a decreasing population, and the resulting concentration of numbers in the upper age groups.

This position represents, of course, striking reversal of the old but recurrent Malthusian doctrine of population increase by geometric progression. The specter which Malthus had raised of misery and famine (and which had given grounds for the characterization of economics as "the dismal science") had disappeared in the face of the new population phenomena. In recognition of what has been termed the "second population Revolution,"² demographers offered a new picture of the "law" of population growth. The graphic presentation of this "law" showed the growth curve as a flattened and somewhat elongated "S." In this view, after a

² Warren S. Thompson, "The Demographic Revolution in the United States," *Annals*, 262 (March, 1949) 62-69.

slow start, population expands into rapid increase, but after a time, for reasons not yet thoroughly clear, this growth loses its impetus and the population slacks off at a fairly stable level. New growth in the same general pattern remains a possibility, but only if the underlying determinants of population undergo a significant change.

BASED ON TRENDS

This new theory, proposed by Raymond Pearl and Lowell Reed, was based on observation of what actually happened to the populations of Western Europe and the United States.³ For many centuries European peoples had increased only slowly, if at all. But with the advent of the Industrial Revolution country after country burst forth from centuries of population stagnation into an almost explosive expansion. This expansion was observed by Malthus and was the motivating factor for his gloomy predictions of overpopulation, with a consequent undersupply of life's necessities. During the half-century from 1800 to 1850, for instance, the population of Great Britain more than doubled (from 10 to 21 million). During the same period, the United

States had jumped from 5 to 23 million, the increase for each decade being at the terrific, unprecedented rate of 35 per cent.

This explosive condition continued in the United States during the entire second half of the 19th century and into the first decades of the 20th. But in the latter part of this period, a continued flood of immigration and a favorable age-composition of the population partially masked the fact that, while with each Census numerical increases were reaching new peaks, the rate of increase was rapidly levelling off. Retarded internal growth was reflecting the gradually accelerating decline in birthrates which had begun almost a century earlier. By the 1920's, this development and the sharp decrease in immigration had progressed to the extent that to most experts the beginning of the Pearl-Reed stabilization period seemed scarcely more than a single generation away.

REVISED ESTIMATES DOWNWARD

By 1930, however, birthrates had dropped so alarmingly that the demographers visualized a stage beyond stabilization, a period of declining population. One of the leaders in

³ Confirmation was seen in Pearl's finding in his controlled "population" experiments with fruit flies. Pearl was of the opinion that *all* growth was fundamentally a biological matter. Thus he states that "human populations grow according to the same law as do the experimental populations of lower organisms, and in turn as do individual plants and animals in body size." (Raymond Pearl, *Biology of Population Growth*, Knopf, New York, 1925, p. 208).

population research, P. K. Whelpton,⁴ of the Scripps Foundation for Research in Population Problems, (who in 1928 had set his forecast⁵ for 1950 at 150,870,000—remarkably accurate, as the event has proved), rejected his own forecasts and scaled down his expectations. Following his own and Warren Thompson's conclusions, in 1934 the National Resources Board settled on the judgment that:

Looking forward to the next 25 years there are only two factors . . . that can be foreseen with reasonable certainty—the gradual approach to a stationary and probably later to a declining population in the nation as a whole . . . and the change in age composition of the people.⁶

An even darker outlook was foreseen by Dr. O. E. Baker of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. In one of the leading papers read at the 1935 National Catholic Rural Life Conference, Dr. Baker pointed out that:

Practically all students of population trends are of the opinion that the birth-rate . . . in the United States has not reached bottom, but will continue to decline.⁷

GLOOMY FUTURE

The economic and social consequences of such a population decline were traced by Dr. Baker in depressing terms:

Looking farther into the future, I am inclined to the view that declining population will tend to induce unemployment. Vacant houses, vacant storerooms, idle factories, abandoned farms will tend to lower rents and interest returns and thereby temporarily lower the cost of living, but the lessened return to capital is likely to depress gradually the spirit of enterprise, and may well lead to increasing dependence upon government. The decreasing number of children probably will diminish the incentive for saving. . . . The greatly increased proportion of old people may have, likewise, a depressing effect.

More serious from a national standpoint . . . will be the great difficulty of

⁴ "American demographers have long depended upon Warren S. Thompson and P. K. Whelpton for estimates of the future population of the United States." (*Population Index*, Vol. 14, No. 3, July, 1948, "The Population Forecasts of the Scripps Foundation," p. 188).

⁵ The terms "forecast," "projection" and "estimate" are frequently used interchangeably. But for the sake of clarity we follow throughout this paper the practice of Jos. S. Davis: "Except as included in titles and quotations, our term 'estimates' refers to approximations of what has already happened, e.g., the population on July 1, 1949, as estimated after that date; our term 'projections' refers to calculations, on various assumptions, of what may happen in the future; and our term 'forecasts' refers to selected projections which the selector considered most likely to be realized in the future. (*The Population Upsurges in the United States*, Jos. S. Davis, War-Peace Pamphlets, No. 12, Food Research Institute, Stanford University, 1949, p. 16).

⁶ National Resources Board, *Part II, Report of the Land Planning Committee* (Washington, U. S. Govt. Printing Office, 1934) p. 116.

⁷ *Catholic Rural Life Objectives: First Series* (National Catholic Rural Life Conference, St. Paul, Minn., 1935) p. 7.

stopping the downward trend. The insufficient number of children in one generation to maintain population stationary will result in a smaller number of mothers, who will, unless the birth-rate rises rapidly, give birth to a still smaller number of daughters. Thus a downward spiral in population is engendered. The probability is that once a decline in population sets in, it will be persistent and progressive.⁸

With this alarming possibility in mind, Louis I. Dublin reversed the Malthusian doctrine with his laconic statement that "If population can increase in a geometric ratio, it can also decrease in the same ratio."⁹

Nor was the picture painted by Dr. Baker in 1936 any brighter. Addressing the same Conference, he presented the problem as one of "survival, not only of our people, but also of our civilization."¹⁰

In 1938, a detailed study of population was published by the National Resources Committee under the significant title, "The Problems of a Changing Population."¹¹ The implication of the title was signified at once, in the first sentence of the text:

It is apparent that great changes are taking place in the population of the United States: transition from an era of rapid growth to a period of stationary or decreasing numbers. . . .¹²

The forecasts of future population incorporated in this study were those of Thompson and Whelpton. In their method of procedure, various hypotheses as to mortality and fertility, rating each as low, medium, or high, were combined to give a wide coverage of possibilities. The *most favorable* combination of factors (low mortality and high fertility) gave a projection of 143,898,000 for 1950, and envisioned the maximum peak of population at 174,330,000 in 1980. The lowest projection, grouping high mortality with low fertility, set the peak at 138,000,000 in 1955, with a 10,000,000 *decrease* in the following quarter century. However, both these projections were considered unrealistic, and the Committee's position was recorded:

In the judgment of this Committee, the analysis of regional trends in birth rates leads to the conclusion that in some parts of the country where birth rates are still high there will be further decline during the next few decades. Furthermore, it seems *extremely unlikely* that this decline will be offset by increases of such magnitude, in areas where birth rates are low, as to cause fertility rates for the Nation as a whole to remain constant.¹³

The forecasts made under these

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

⁹ Quoted in *Land Economics*, Richard T. Ely and George S. Wehrwein, Macmillan, 1940, p. 12.

¹⁰ *Catholic Rural Life Objectives: Second Series*, National Catholic Rural Life Conference, 1936, p. 63.

¹¹ *Problems of a Changing Population*: Report of the Committee on Population Problems of the National Resources Committee, Washington, 1938.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 6.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 24; italics added.

"realistic" assumptions were, for "low" fertility, 137 million in 1950 and a peak of 139,457,000 in 1960; while with "medium" fertility after reaching 140,561,000 in 1950, the peak would come in the 1980's with slightly over 153 million.¹⁴

The complete unreality of these forecasts is obvious in the light of the 1950 Census findings. But to be fair to those responsible for the above forecasts, one should record their warning:

Caution in the use of estimates of future population has been emphasized throughout this report, while at the same time there has been an insistence on the importance of such estimates. Estimates of future population trends . . . are particularly hazardous. The use of refined mathematical procedures sometimes tends to obscure the hypothetical character of such extrapolations. . . . All population estimates are dependent on arbitrary hypotheses, expressed or implied.¹⁵

Still the authors should have taken their own warnings more seriously. It is true that they insist on precautions in using their projections. But throughout the study they also indicate their own firm acceptance of specific hypotheses and the forecasts based on these assumptions. In innumerable

ways, implicitly and explicitly, they manifest the certain expectation of their "medium" or "low" assumptions. If they, the outstanding representatives of a supposedly exacting science,¹⁶ did not fear to commit themselves to a particular narrow range of possibilities, what more could they expect from those of less experience in this specialized field of knowledge?

FORTY PER CENT ERROR

Moreover, they accompanied their warnings with the assurance that, at worst, they could not be far off, at least in the short run:

Estimates of the total population of the United States in the near future that have a fair degree of reliability can be made without taking hypothetical changes in economic conditions into account, because changes in birth and death rates follow long-time trends in social organization and personal habits.¹⁷

But they stand charged with no *small* degree of error. Starting from the given population of 1935—127,354,000—the forecasts of increase to 1950 are in error over 40 per cent for the "medium," and over 50 per cent for the "low" assumption. As

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 24, Table 2.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 253-254.

¹⁶ These various series of projections, the most comprehensive available for any nation of the world, have done much to achieve for population projections the status of an accepted instrument of governmental planning. . . . The development of the projection reflects the rapid advance of demographic techniques and of the census and vital statistics data." *Population Index*, *op. cit.*, p. 188.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 254.

Peter Drucker, the noted economist, has commented:

Compared to the total debacle of the population expert, the famous flop of the public-opinion pollsters two years ago looks like a very minor mishap indeed. In predicting Dewey's election, Doctor Gallup was, after all, only 5 per cent off.¹⁸

How far the 1938 predictions may be in error as to the timing and total of the envisioned "population peak," will be taken up later in this paper.

Subsequent publications of this same source make it evident that the assumptions here adopted took on the stature almost of first principles. In 1943, another report appeared—an ambitious work, *Estimates of the Future Population of the United States, 1940-2000*.¹⁹ The authors apparently had found nothing in the meantime to call for revision of their assumptions. For both the short and the long run their projections are substantially the same as those made in 1938. Thus, their forecasts for 1945 ranged from 137,318,000 (assuming low fertility, high mortality, no immigration) to 137,738,000 with high fertility, low mortality, no immigration.

Nevertheless events were beginning to force revisions. Still another report was issued by Whelpton, in 1947,

this time under the official aegis of the Census Bureau.²⁰ Explaining that this new report was a revision of the 1943 study, the author confessed:

In spite of the excess mortality of 200,000 up to April 1, 1945, resulting from the war, the population on the latter date was approximately 139,254,000 . . . or about 1,516,000 above the highest forecast.²¹

An explanation was offered:

Events *peculiar to the war years* have caused the population to change in size and composition in a somewhat different way than had been anticipated when the preceding estimates were prepared.²²

The implication of the phrase "peculiar to the war years" was clearly indicated to be that the upsetting factors were merely passing phenomena of insufficient weight to shake underlying assumptions. Indeed, the author stated that:

If the events of 1940-1945 had indicated that there were serious discrepancies in the assumptions regarding future fertility and mortality trends, a revision of the forecasts would have been even more urgent. For reasons discussed . . . however, only relatively unimportant changes in these assumptions seemed advisable.²³

In fact, one of the most "peculiar" events of the war years was the unprecedented "baby boom." As Joseph

¹⁸ Peter F. Drucker, "Are We Having Too Many Babies?" *Saturday Evening Post*, May 6, 1950, p. 41.

¹⁹ National Resources Planning Board, prepared by Warren S. Thompson and P. K. Whelpton, Washington, 1943.

²⁰ *Forecasts of the Population of the United States, 1945-1975*. U. S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Washington, 1947.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 1; emphasis added.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 1; emphasis added.

²³ *Ibid.*

S. Davis has pointed out,²⁴ all other war decades in American history (with the single exception of 1840-1850, which included the brief Mexican war of 1846-1847) have shown a lower rate of population increase than the preceding one. In this case the increase attained noteworthy proportions during the war years as well as after.

UNPRECEDENTED RISE

This phenomenon was indeed "peculiar" in view of the previous assumptions of the demographers as to the effects of war on population. With few dissenting voices the opinion of scholars declared that "war will undoubtedly accelerate the decline in the rate of population growth."²⁵ Thompson had expressed the same conviction in his 1944 book, *Plenty of People*, in which he devoted a chapter to "War and Population Growth." There he stated unequivocally that "even under the most favorable conditions . . . war does have a very depressing effect on population growth."²⁶

When the effect of the war years on U. S. population proved to be anything but depressing, it should have been an indication to the demographers that the times were "out of joint"; that their assumptions and statistical

deductions were being "betrayed" by millions of acts of the human will.

Still doggedly pursuing the assumptions adopted in the 30's, Whelpton took care of the unexpected 1943-1947 "surplus" by jacking up the expectations by that amount and by pushing the population peak somewhat higher and later (up to 164,585,000 in 1990).

Oddly enough, the author found it necessary to add a footnote to the table of forecasts, stating that data obtained too late for inclusion in the table indicated that the estimates for 1946 and 1947 were too low, by 389,000 and 1,714,000, respectively. The necessity of this correction, however, did not prevent the reassertion of the conviction that a notable decline was in the offing:

A sharp decrease is expected in the next year or two. . . . The outlook after 1950 is for a continuation of the long-time decline in population growth, both in absolute numbers and rate. Moreover, there is a strong possibility that within a few decades the population will reach its maximum size and will begin to decrease unless heavy immigration is resumed. . . . It is to be noted that the prospect of an eventual cessation of population growth in the United States is *inherent* in the present age structure of the population.²⁷

²⁴ Jos. S. Davis, "Fifty Million More Americans," *Foreign Affairs*, 28, (April, 1950) 416.

²⁵ Philip Hauser (*American Journal of Sociology*, November, 1942), quoted by Joseph S. Davis, *The Population Upsurge in the United States*, p. 55.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 56.

²⁷ P. K. Whelpton, *op. cit.* pp. 39-40; emphasis added.

And so, with confidence apparently unshaken, the population for July 1, 1950, (just three years ahead) was forecast at 145,460,000—low by more than five and a half million. Here again, starting from the given population base (1945: 139,621,000), the forecast missed by 50 per cent.

This average of error persisted through a report issued as late as February, 1949. Though forced again by current data to lift the count for 1948 and 1949, and looking ahead now for only *one year*, the new short-term revision of the 1950 forecast again badly undershot the mark, by some two million.

To the average man it is puzzling, to say the least, that in the face of such consistent miscalculation no thorough re-examination was made of the assumptions on which the forecasts were based. Instead, there has seemed to be a blind, almost desperate adherence to positions which facts had long since proved untenable.

Even a casual survey of the leading economic writings, for instance, shows how widely and deeply the population expectations of the demog-

raphers for the last two or three decades have entered as basic data into economic thinking and long-range social policy. Exploring this fact is beyond the scope of this present article. But this much may be said here: Such a study leads to the imperative conclusion that, while possibilities and even probabilities of population behavior may be worked out, to place too much confidence in any one possibility, or to eliminate other possibilities from consideration simply because they do not conform to past or present patterns, may lead—as it did in this case—to embarrassing and even disastrous errors.

If the demographers have failed so resoundingly in their short-run forecasts, what is to be said of their long-term expectations? Here also, without doubt, they have floundered badly. With the facts now in hand one can assert with confidence that any talk of a population "peak" in this century simply refuses to face reality. Indeed, there is little reason now to expect such a peak *at any time*, as if there were some kind of "law" setting an upper limit on population growth.

Subsidiarity

In Catholic social philosophy it is wrong to take from individuals what they can accomplish by their own initiative and industry. Thus "it is an injustice and at the same time a grave evil and disturbance of right order to assign to a greater and higher group what lesser and subordinate organizations can do." This guiding "principle of subsidiary function," as it is called, must be our yardstick when we measure the desirable activity of the State.—PANEL, February, 1952.

Priests, Communists and Eskimos

LOUIS HUBER

Reprinted from THE PROGRESSIVE*

COMMUNISM came close to setting foot in Western Alaska last summer when 1,400 Eskimos and 1,000 resident fishermen were under strong pressure to accept the domination of Harry Bridges' International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union. Neither group would have any part of the ILWU, however; today they are enfolded by Harry Lundeborg's Seafarer's International Union. The SIU, a part of the AFL, is strongly anti-Communist—so almost everybody is breathing easier for awhile.

Everybody, perhaps, except Lt. Gen. William E. Kepner, commanding general of the Alaskan Command. Like a steamship captain on a stormy night, he has to stay awake even if all other hands go to sleep—and the last thing he wants is a bunch of Communists putting out welcome mats at the edge of the Arctic Ocean.

"Communists in the Eskimo labor groups *would* give me something to worry about," General Kepner told this reporter.

The Eskimos involved live in coastal areas as far north as Kotzebue, above the Arctic Circle. They

LOUIS R. HUBER, formerly a reporter with the Des Moines Register and the Washington bureau of the Associated Press, has been specializing more recently in freelance writing on Alaska—an interest he acquired while working as a wireless operator for the U. S. Coast and Geodetic Survey aboard its vessels in Alaska. His articles have appeared in the Atlantic, American Magazine, Collier's, Travel, and Natural History.

are full-fledged citizens, and their loyalty never has been questioned. But they are just now emerging from their Stone Age culture. Their cannery pay-checks enable them for the first time to leave their ancestral sod huts and tents, build better dwellings, and adopt some of the white man's ways.

It is a ticklish process; elsewhere in Alaska the natives have fared both well and ill at it—depending on the kind of white leadership that appeared. In this case the change is doubly crucial, for if the Eskimos are not enabled quickly, sympathetically and stably to adopt some measure of the American standard of

* 408 W. Gorman St., Madison 3, Wis., February, 1952.

living, they may become frustrated candidates for Communism.

Under that compulsion it is conceivable that their loyalty might be corrupted. And military authorities are not forgetting that *Pravda* some time ago declared that Alaska still belongs to Russia—because the Tsars sold it without the consent of the Russian people.

STRANGE ALLIANCE

At the height of events last summer the Alaska Salmon Industry, Inc., representing nearly all of Alaska's canneries, was found in bed with a union dominated by Harry Bridges' crowd. The only way to explain this tender relationship with a Red-tinted union is to realize that a buck is a buck—and if the Commies are selling labor cheaper, why, that's where some people will buy.

The scene of this curious alliance is the bleak shore of Bristol Bay, the world's largest red-salmon fishing area. From \$15 million to \$50 million worth of canned salmon, depending on how the fish run, is produced there each year. All but a trickle of this wealth goes south, however—most of it to corporations in Seattle, Bellingham and San Francisco.

Not so long ago Bristol Bay was deserted, except for the Eskimos living along its shores. Annually the salmon arrived in a rush, beginning late in June; within four weeks they struggled up the Egegik, Kvichak,

Naknek, Nushagak and Ugashik rivers to their spawning grounds. It was a set-up for canneries—assured fish, short season, and then home with the goods.

At first the canneries were manned by Chinese, brought north in the holds of ships. In later years Filipinos were brought in gangs, contracted out by private employment agencies. The fishing was done in picturesque but dangerous sailboats (several drownings occurred every year), mainly by Italians and Scandinavians who signed on in San Francisco and Seattle. Occasionally some of the fisherman would stay north when the fishing was ended and gradually Bristol Bay acquired a resident white population.

Nobody ever thought of putting the Eskimos to work. Good-natured, happy-go-lucky people, they grinned at the white man and went about their lives as their ancestors had done for centuries. But with World War II Filipinos were drained off into other channels. The canneries had to hire Eskimos, and they got the surprise of their lives. The dark-skinned, parka-clad Eskimos were superior workers—handy with tools, quick at understanding machinery, and happy to do whatever task they were given. After the war the canneries were delighted to keep on hiring them.

Unionism spread over the Alaska canneries in the great sweep of or-

ganized labor in the 1930's. Four main labor groupings resulted: Stateside fishermen and cannery workers on the one hand, and resident fishermen and (Eskimo) cannery workers on the other. Post-war years found them aligned union-wise like this: resident fishermen and Stateside fishermen in the Alaska Fishermen's Union; Eskimo cannery workers in "Local 46"—all affiliated with the International Fishermen and Allied Workers of America (IFAWA)—a part of the CIO. The fourth group—the Stateside cannery workers (Filipinos, still coming north each summer but in lesser numbers)—belonged to the Food, Tobacco, and Agricultural Workers (FTA), also CIO.

When the CIO began cleaning itself of Communists, however, both IFAWA and FTA, along with Harry Bridges' ILWU, were marked for expulsion. Just before the CIO axe fell, leaders of the three groups sought to consolidate their positions by a merger which would make Bridges' ILWU the central and dominant body. But Bristol Bay resident fishermen opposed this merger; they preferred to be either independent or AFL.

The resulting jurisdictional struggle has been warming up for the past two years. It boiled over last spring when the salmon industry took sides by recognizing the Bridges-dominated groups and when the two

Bristol Bay unions pulled away from their previous affiliations and took charters in Harry Lundeborg's AFL Seafarers. It boiled again when the Bering Sea Fishermen's Union (BSFU), as the resident fishermen called their newly-formed group, went on strike in protest against the industry's action, and Lundeborg's sailors cooperated staunchly by refusing to unload cargo shipped north for cannery operations.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNISM

BSFU leaders analyze the industry's pro-ILWU stand as pure economic opportunism: the ILWU-dominated fishermen signed up for 40 cents a fish, while the BSFU demanded 60 cents. The industry claims it had to sign up with the ILWU-dominated groups because its cargoes—supplies going north, canned salmon moving south—are handled by ILWU longshoremen along the Pacific Coast. "If we offend the ILWU, we risk a costly work stoppage," they said.

The key to this situation last summer was the Eskimos. If they could be swung into Bridges' ILWU camp, the pressure would be too great for the resident BSFU fishermen. The whole Bristol Bay union framework might then have swung into the Bridges orbit. But the Eskimos spurned the industry's proffered contract—a somewhat better one than that signed with the Filipino cannery

workers; but the contract required them to work regardless of whether the BSFU obtained a contract. In short, it required them to serve as strikebreakers.

As a last resort to win its way, the industry began flying the Eskimos back to their villages, telling them there was no work because of the jurisdictional aspect of the dispute. Even then the Eskimos stood firm, giving up their season's employment rather than offend the resident fishermen. This Eskimo decision was unanimous; it broke the industry's plan. The fishing season had arrived a week before. Seeing the Eskimos unmoved by its gyrations, the industry quickly signed up with the BSFU—the latter accepting the 40-cent fish price willingly as long as solidarity was unbroken, out of gratitude to the Eskimos.

A contract was signed with the Eskimos, too, on substantially the same terms as the previous industry offer—but without the offensive strikebreaking clause. A welfare fund—the single gain—was established for the benefit of both groups; it levied a 20-cents-a-case payment from the industry. The pack in Bristol Bay last summer was about 300,000 cases, making the fund total around \$60,000—money which is now being used for relief of the neediest members.

Key men in the struggle, which may recur this summer, were Jim

Downey, resident fisherman, husband of a part-Eskimo wife and father of seven children; two Jesuit missionary priests; and a minister of the Church of Christ.

PRIESTS' ACTIVITY

Industry representatives and agents of Harry Bridges were outspokenly bitter over the priests' activity.

"If those priests would turn their collars around and mind their church business, things would go better around here," W. C. Arnold, managing director of Alaska Salmon Industry, Inc., growled to this reporter.

Previously Bjorne Halling, an ILWU representative, had complained to Bishop Francis J. Gleeson at Juneau that Father Jules M. Convert, one of the priests, "took leave from his work in the church" to mix into union activities. The Bishop handed Halling's appeal to Father Convert for reply and the latter explained that "when you find me in Bristol Bay, it is not because 'I took leave from my work in the church': it is because my church work is right there, where my people are."

The residents of Bristol Bay, regardless of creed, understood and approved the priests' work—for it is calculated to channel a bit of the great salmon wealth back onto Bristol Bay shores. At Dillingham, "capital" of the area, the 400-odd residents already are showing results from the

modest amount of salmon revenue plowed back. They are working on plans for a municipal water system, electric lights and a sewer—and a Government loan is on the way to help them.

But Arnold, salmon-industry trouble-shooter, has promised he'll be back next summer—to press, at the very last moment, as usual, for the same objectives as before. If he succeeds, the Dillingham people can forget their community improvements for a while. There won't be enough money to pay for them; instead, all the salmon wealth will be funneled into the coffers of the rich salmon packers.

No thoughtful person who understands what is happening here can fail to wonder if this is the greatest good that can come from the largesse that God placed in Bristol Bay; if the rich red salmon could not serve a better purpose in helping to bring the vaunted American standard of living to the poverty-stricken, struggling communities of Western Alaska; if it would not be simple sense for the industry to acknowledge its social responsibility, forego some of its profits, and extend a helping hand to lift the genial Eskimos from the Stone Age, without courting the dangers of Communism, into our Christian civilization.



New Goal Needed

Collectivist economic states, like the billion-dollar corporations listed every year by the United Press, are national organizations owned by many, managed by few, with vast numbers of employees who are unable to protect their individual economic interest except by organization. The business groups are organized, industrial groups are organized, financial groups, labor groups, agricultural groups, and consumers all are organized, pursuing their separate and distinct courses to protect special interests, while the common good of all is neglected. Yet, unless the common good is served, none of the special groups can succeed. In a business economy, the activities of these groups are perfectly understandable. But in a defense economy, let me repeat, they have no place, for class conflict will inevitably destroy the entire struggle for both economic and political freedom.—*Senator Joseph C. O'Mahoney at a meeting of the Catholic Economic Association, Boston, Mass., Dec. 29, 1951.*

Protestant Panorama¹

JOHN A. MCALPINE

*Reprinted from CANADIAN MESSENGER OF THE SACRED HEART**

SINCE the close of the Second World War the main political concern of the West has been the menace of Communist Russia. Before Stalin made his alliance with Hitler in 1939 and thereby enabled Socialist Germany to assault the free world, the Soviet imperialists had been forced to content themselves with underground attacks on other States. After the fall of the Third Reich and the abandonment of the countries of Eastern Europe by the United States and England, Bolshevism, finding itself armed and Europe undefended, took full advantage of the opportunity and pushed its grim sway half-way across the Continent. There it still lies, smothering European civilization, threatening to bring on a Third World War, and forcing us to strain all our resources. What are our resources.

Chief among them is religion. We need not mention the atomic bomb and other weapons, without which we might well have failed before now to resist Russian aggression. These are products of our culture, which,

in turn, grew out of our religion. Western science is one of the products of Christendom. The Bolsheviks may not know this, but they are well aware of the importance of religion among the forces opposing them. Indeed, they have given such publicity to their attacks on the Church that even the not-too-well informed public in Western countries habitually thinks of a Communist as a person who is, primarily, anti-Christian. Those who might deny that Christianity is our greatest asset in the fight against Bolshevism would do well to consider the fact that Stalin and his friends seem to think so.

Why have the followers of Karl Marx, hard-headed materialists, considered the Church to be their most formidable enemy in a world that is commonly regarded as having in large measure abandoned Christ for gold and other emoluments? The correct answer would seem to be that the Bolsheviks, aware that their own strength lies in religion—the worship of human power—have realized instinctively that under all the dross

¹ *Protestant Panorama: A Story in Text and Pictures of the Faith that Made America Free.* By Clarence W. Hall and Desider Holisher. With an introduction by Charles P. Taft. Cloth. Price, \$4.50. 180 pages. Clarke, Irwin & Co. Ltd., Toronto.

* 2 Dale Ave., Toronto, Ont., Canada, March, 1962.

of modern life the effective capacity for resistance in their Western opponents is still supplied by the Christian Church. This is a rather simple idea, but it is not as well known as it should be.

A SECULAR RELIGION

At heart Communism is a secular religion worshipping material force and aiming at the greatest possible development and concentration of human power. Christianity, in contrast, is a supernatural religion worshipping divine power (God) and aiming at the greatest possible manifestation of God's power in human affairs. Once these facts are grasped firmly it not difficult to understand Bolshevism's attitude to the Church.

Yet there is wide-spread confusion, ignorance and misinformation today about this subject. One of the sources of these unfortunate conditions is the lying propaganda of the Communists, who strive by every device available to them to deceive the world into thinking that in the war between communism and Christianity it is the former, and not the latter, that stands for freedom and opposes despotism and slavery.

Another source, one regrets to say, of the failure of the West to understand adequately the nature of the fight with Bolshevism is the persistent effort of certain publicists among us to propagate the idea that the Christian Church fights Stalin and his fol-

lowers not for liberty, but for power. What makes it possible for these people to enjoy considerable success in their nefarious work is the deplorable ignorance of history, especially of modern history, among Western peoples. Were we as fully aware as we should be of the true character and the origin of the Revolution of which Russian Bolshevism is the most impressive form today, we should scarcely be troubled by these writers in our midst; for their work would then be regarded less as part of our defense than as part of the attack in the struggle we are now maintaining against Communism.

The Revolution began in the Middle Ages with the rise of the modern State. The Christian Church was then at the height of its civilizing career and enjoyed considerable authority. This was true less of the East, in the regions about Constantinople, than of the West, whose center was Rome. The Roman Empire, originally pagan, had survived in the eastern part of Christendom, and with it had been preserved only too much of the spirit of its origin. Its rulers were, on the whole, disposed to regard the Church as a prop for the State rather than as an institution with independent purposes and rights. It is worth remembering that in the 15th century, when the Empire went down under the assaults of the Turks, the daughter of the last Emperor married a ruler

of Russia, and the Russians began to consider themselves as the heirs of the Eastern Roman world.

Meanwhile in the West the collapse of the Empire had occurred in the fifth century, and for several hundred years no comparable power arose. In these circumstances the Church was free to develop along natural lines; and, although the Empire was revived, it never became strong enough to overshadow Christianity permanently. The result was the rise of a civilization unique in many respects and incomparably superior to anything that had been achieved before. For the first time in history a great civilization had been erected on a basis of freedom. Never before had a wide-spread culture arisen containing a principle of life entirely in harmony with the natural law. Now at last it was possible for mankind to look forward to an era of endless progress. But there was a fly in the ointment which was to swell to monstrous proportions and threaten to destroy the healthy medium in which it first appeared. This was the National Sovereign State.

CHURCH AND STATE

There is no essential hostility between the Christian Church and the State. The purpose of civil government is to promote the secular well-being of the people under its authority; and with this aim the Church is in entire agreement. Where trouble

is bound to arise is the point at which the State attempts to overstep the boundaries of its legitimate sphere of authority. Such usurpation occurs whenever the State acts as if it were above the natural law and demands of its subjects conduct which it has no right to exact.

This is what the National State did early in its career. Kings, for example, attempted to control the elections of officers in the Church and to interfere with religious property and government. Such irregularities long remained subordinate to the general welfare of Christendom, but in the 16th century the Revolution, which till then had been restrained in the rising States of Europe, burst forth in a great conflagration and destroyed much of the old order. Now the Prince, who had formerly been regarded as subject to law, became absolute, and rebels from the ranks of the Christian clergy came forward to expound religious doctrines to sanctify the change. Best known of these revolutionary clerics, perhaps, is Martin Luther, who invented the theory known as "the divine right of kings."

As a result of this Revolution, which had thus shattered Christendom, Europe was subjected over wide areas to the despotic rule of absolute monarchs and to the tyranny of oligarchies and State Churches. Representative government, one of the many inventions of

the Middle Ages, almost everywhere died out; the guilds of free workmen were destroyed or exploited by the rich; national "uniformity" replaced European unity in religion; the natural law was subordinated to the appetites of rulers; slavery was restored in colonial areas; the property of the Church was seized to enrich classes or to strengthen the despotism of kings; education, the charge of the Church, was neglected; the poor, the wards of the Church, were starved and persecuted; and everywhere war, the instrument of unchecked power, spread ruin, desolation and decline. For decades and even for centuries these were the obvious and undeniable results of the Revolution that had manifested itself in European religion in the 16th century.

CHANGES FOR THE BETTER

In the course of time there came changes for the better; but these changes were far slower in coming than most of our contemporaries have been taught to think, and they were the result of accidents or forces foreign or hostile to the Revolution. Prominent among these forces was the availability of free land in America. The discovery of America by Christopher Columbus, sailing under the flag of Spain, revealed the New World to Europeans a generation before the Revolution in religion occurred. Partly as a consequence of

the paralyzing effect of the Revolutionary struggle on Europe, the riches of most of North America remained undeveloped for a century. It was only after religious strife in France had subsided that the French, early in the 16th century, succeeded in planting a successful colony in Canada.

For opposite reasons colonies of a different sort were founded by English-speaking settlers along the Atlantic seaboard. The national Church of England, created by the Tudor monarchs during the religious Revolution of the 16th century, persecuted "dissenters" so bitterly under the first Charles Stuart that thousands were driven to seek new homes in New England. Here they proved that the religious Revolution had not sought "freedom of conscience" for the individual, for they set up governments which outdid that of England in persecuting those who would not conform to the religious views of the leaders.

The same lesson was taught even more emphatically when a new upsurge of the Revolution in England put "dissenters" in the saddle for a decade or more. Oliver Cromwell, who had fought the religious and political tyranny of Charles I and the "High Church" Anglicans, became a worse religious and political tyrant than Charles and showed a mind that regarded death and slavery appropriate treatments for the people of a

foreign country, Ireland, attempting to preserve the religion to which it had belonged for ten centuries. Cromwell's tyranny, in turn, drove many Anglicans to America. These, like their predecessors, sought religious freedom for themselves. But few Englishmen of that age believed in tolerance. Only in Maryland, where Lord Baltimore opened a colony for persecuted Catholics, was tolerance established; and no sooner had non-Catholics in sufficient numbers arrived than the characteristic bigotry and intolerance of the Revolution prevailed. America was not yet "the land of the free."

About the beginning of the 18th century a lull in religious persecution seemed to occur in both Europe and America. Either opposition had been wiped out or a new attitude was beginning to prevail. Over most of Northern Europe governments had destroyed Catholicism by force or by fraud. Only in Ireland had a long and savage persecution failed, and it was to rage for almost another century unchecked, then to relax through fear rather than through love. In New England people were not as likely to be put to death for their beliefs as they had been. Throughout Europe greed was beginning to soften bigotry. England secured a monopoly in the slave-trade, went mad over stock-market speculation, and allowed non-Catholic non-Anglicans to hold office for a

year at a time. As the 18th century wore on, faint signs of returning liberty strengthened and increased in number. Meanwhile the Revolution was preparing to create an upheaval in France and was laying foundations for fantastic future successes in Germany and Russia. But simultaneously with these sinister developments there were occurring in the world two sets of changes which, combined, were to produce the condition that we know as modern freedom. One of these was the march of the American frontier westward; the other was the revival of medieval ideas of the nature of liberty.

POPULATION SHIFTS

Even as the religious Revolution in England forced thousands to flee to America to escape persecution, so the intolerance of most of these refugees produced further movements of population in the New World. Charles I of England, Archbishop Laud and the High Church Anglicans, by their persecution of Puritans, peopled Massachusetts. These Puritans, in turn, by their intolerance in religion drove some of their fellow refugees to found a new settlement in Rhode Island. This scene was to be reenacted many times in the history of the United States. Settlement continually expanded westward, and the main impulse was less the pressure of population than the stimulating force of persecution or injustice.

One of the biggest migrations that helped to make up this movement came from Ulster in the early 18th century. It consisted mostly of Presbyterians escaping from the ruinous effects of English religious and economic oppression. It moved westward to the Alleghany Mountains, then southward along the high valleys. It brought bitter memories of the intolerance of the English religious Revolution, and it helped to make possible the American Revolution.

Before the close of the 18th century thousands of settlers had crossed the Alleghanies in search of various sorts of freedom. They were moving out into regions which were beyond the control of any government, out where men were more important than money and where labor was far more valuable than capital. Here, by the very nature of things, the family was quite evidently antecedent to the State, and a good neighbor was more precious than jewels. This was the birthplace of modern democracy, a place chosen for the most part by victims of the religious Revolution that began in Europe in the 16th century. It was also the graveyard for the Indian. For the newcomers showed that they had been poisoned by the same force from which they were trying to escape when they evolved the doctrine that "the only good Indian is a dead Indian" and systematically put the theory into practice.

It was not until well on in the 19th century that the democracy engendered by the conditions on the frontier produced political democracy in the United States as a whole. Andrew Jackson, elected President in 1828, was the first successful democratic candidate; and he won office only with the assistance of Southern slave-owners. It was now over two centuries since the Pilgrims had landed on the Rock. Democracy had come in spite of, not because of, the religion of most of the settlers, and there was still little religious freedom in the seaboard States.

BIGOTRY PERSISTS

These States eased their intolerance only grudgingly as they competed for laborers with the inviting open spaces to the west. It was still possible for Catholic convents to be burned and for Catholics to be murdered by mobs in the Eastern States when the Irish began to immigrate in large numbers in the mid-19th century. This bigotry was part and parcel of that which had been displayed from the beginning by the religious Revolution which began in the 16th century. This, and not freedom, was the true heritage of that Revolution. Free land alone had made it impracticable for the heirs of the Revolution to preserve intact their essential tendency to persecute those who did not "conform" to their own religious views.

But free land in America was not the only source of modern freedom and democracy. The theory that lies behind representative government today is medieval, and it was in large measure the revival of that theory that made possible the constitutional government of the past century and a half. The original thinker to whom we owe the idea of modern democracy and representative government is St. Thomas Aquinas, a Neopolitan friar of the 13th century. In the Middle Ages the theories of St. Thomas were applied widely, and there arose representative governments in many States, such as Spain, France and England, and in thousands of smaller administrative units. Most of these were impaired or destroyed through the rise of the modern Sovereign State and the effect of the religious Revolution. But the theory survived and was used from time to time to resist the new oppression, as when the Puritans in the Parliaments of Charles I appealed to it against the despotism of the Anglican divine-right monarchy. Later the theory was used by the American colonists to resist the tyranny of Britain under George III and by the French to overthrow the despotic Bourbon monarchy.

It was even applied in England by those who opposed the policy of coercing the American colonies, and, indeed, there and then was embodied in one of its most classic forms in

the speeches and writings of the great Irish orator, Edmund Burke. It would be easy to show that it was totally foreign to the thinking of the religious Revolutionaries of the 16th century and to that of their patrons and heirs—to Luther, Calvin, and Knox; to the Tudors, the Stuarts, the Bourbons, and the Hanoverians; to the persecutors who filled America with refugees; and to most of the latter who in turn drove dissenters to the interior of the new continent.

DISTORTION AND MISSTATEMENT

These are views of the "Protestant Panorama" which will not be found in the book to which reference was made in the title of this article. It is true that the authors of the volume admit some of the most telling facts upon which these views are based, but they attempt to use them to make plausible the idea presented in the sub-title. In order to show that the *Protestant Panorama* is "A Story of the Faith that Made America Free," they resort to a very wide variety of devices—suppression, distortion, exaggeration, outright misstatement, innuendo and shameless appeals to the lowest intellectual qualities of their audience—to ignorance, prejudice, bigotry, superstition and irreverence. Indeed, it is painful to think that there might exist anywhere any considerable public that would buy the book after discovering the sort of rubbish it contains, or that could

read it through without being disgusted.

Unfortunately it is only too true that a very large proportion of the English-speaking populace today is ill-equipped to resist propaganda based on false history. One of the reasons for this condition is the misuse of history by the supporters of the Revolution. We may smile at the wild distortions of the past indulged in by the followers of Joseph Stalin. But they are no wilder than those propagated by the religious Revolutionists of the 16th century and by their patrons and successors. This fact is evidenced by some of the most famous and most respected of modern historians. It should be made known to every one and repeated endlessly to every rising generation. One of the oldest safeguards of the Revolution is distortion of history.

One wonders whose axe Mr. Hall and Mr. Holisher are grinding. Though their ostensible purpose is to trace United States freedom to Protestantism, they seem to be almost as

much, if not more concerned at every step to attack the Catholic Church. Here they join hands with Stalin and his cohorts, and it is useless to pretend otherwise. If Mr. Hall and Mr. Holisher really believe that the *Protestant Panorama* is actually "A Story of the Faith that Made America Free," why are they not content to stick to their subject? It is not necessary to mention the Catholic Church in explaining why English-speaking America was populated. It was not Catholic England that drove the Puritans, the Anglicans, the Presbyterians and others to seek refuge in the New World. The only people who in those days tried to establish tolerance in what is now the United States were the Catholics of Maryland, but for them Mr. Hall and Mr. Holisher have only a sneer.

One is inevitably brought back to the question: Why was the book written and published? But its production should cause pleasure in Moscow and win from Joseph Stalin medals for its authors.

Challenge to America

Both in the American age and the Christian age which I think is already opening, American Catholics will have a gigantic role to play. Not only the world is looking to America today for strength and guidance and recuperation. The Church also is looking to America. For from America must come not only the greatest material contribution to the work of the Church's world-wide missions; but the greatest contribution in manpower and womanpower also.—*Joseph A. Breig in the FAR EAST, May, 1952.*

Catholics and the Labor Party

R. P. WALSH

Editor (English) CATHOLIC WORKER

*Reprinted from BLACKFRIARS**

FOR good or for ill there is every chance that the Labor Party will control the destiny of this country for perhaps fifty out of the next hundred years, and as it is a party that attracts strong support from a large proportion of the Catholics in this country it is important to think of the position of these Catholics within it. In the major industrial centers the majority of Catholics in the working class support Labor; indeed, it was once estimated in the columns of this review by Lord Pakenham that 80 per cent of the Catholic body voted Labor, and even if we agree that this figure is high, the percentage must still be very significant.

Unfortunately most of those Catholics with the ability to write and to project their ideas into the world of thought and of literature tend to be supporters of the Conservative Party, and they in no way represent the general opinion of the Catholic body. When one moves at what might be called the national level of Catholic Action, one finds that most of the leaders are also Conservative. No one can doubt the right of these writers

or leaders to follow the politics they hold, nor can one doubt their ability to write and their ability to give time to the leadership of the Catholic body. They accomplish a magnificent job for the Catholic community. Yet it is unfortunate that so one-sided an impression is given of the Catholic attitude towards our political parties.

It may be held that this writer is exaggerating, perhaps for the sake of effect. The facts are not easily set out without an elaborate survey and are recorded here as a considered opinion by one who mixes considerably with these leaders. Further, when in such company the conversation turns to politics, it is amazing how often the few Labor supporters present are placed on the defensive. The attitude is usually "how can a decent chap like you belong to the Labor Party?" At the same time it is regarded as something natural to support the Conservative Party. It must be added that there are probably more on the other side who cannot understand how a Catholic can support the Conservative Party,

* 34 Bloomsbury St., London, W.C. 1, England, February, 1952.

One of the biggest migrations that helped to make up this movement came from Ulster in the early 18th century. It consisted mostly of Presbyterians escaping from the ruinous effects of English religious and economic oppression. It moved westward to the Alleghany Mountains, then southward along the high valleys. It brought bitter memories of the intolerance of the English religious Revolution, and it helped to make possible the American Revolution.

Before the close of the 18th century thousands of settlers had crossed the Alleghanies in search of various sorts of freedom. They were moving out into regions which were beyond the control of any government, out where men were more important than money and where labor was far more valuable than capital. Here, by the very nature of things, the family was quite evidently antecedent to the State, and a good neighbor was more precious than jewels. This was the birthplace of modern democracy, a place chosen for the most part by victims of the religious Revolution that began in Europe in the 16th century. It was also the graveyard for the Indian. For the newcomers showed that they had been poisoned by the same force from which they were trying to escape when they evolved the doctrine that "the only good Indian is a dead Indian" and systematically put the theory into practice.

It was not until well on in the 19th century that the democracy engendered by the conditions on the frontier produced political democracy in the United States as a whole. Andrew Jackson, elected President in 1828, was the first successful democratic candidate; and he won office only with the assistance of Southern slave-owners. It was now over two centuries since the Pilgrims had landed on the Rock. Democracy had come in spite of, not because of, the religion of most of the settlers, and there was still little religious freedom in the seaboard States.

BIGOTRY PERSISTS

These States eased their intolerance only grudgingly as they competed for laborers with the inviting open spaces to the west. It was still possible for Catholic convents to be burned and for Catholics to be murdered by mobs in the Eastern States when the Irish began to immigrate in large numbers in the mid-19th century. This bigotry was part and parcel of that which had been displayed from the beginning by the religious Revolution which began in the 16th century. This, and not freedom, was the true heritage of that Revolution. Free land alone had made it impracticable for the heirs of the Revolution to preserve intact their essential tendency to persecute those who did not "conform" to their own religious views.

But free land in America was not the only source of modern freedom and democracy. The theory that lies behind representative government today is medieval, and it was in large measure the revival of that theory that made possible the constitutional government of the past century and a half. The original thinker to whom we owe the idea of modern democracy and representative government is St. Thomas Aquinas, a Neopolitan friar of the 13th century. In the Middle Ages the theories of St. Thomas were applied widely, and there arose representative governments in many States, such as Spain, France and England, and in thousands of smaller administrative units. Most of these were impaired or destroyed through the rise of the modern Sovereign State and the effect of the religious Revolution. But the theory survived and was used from time to time to resist the new oppression, as when the Puritans in the Parliaments of Charles I appealed to it against the despotism of the Anglican divine-right monarchy. Later the theory was used by the American colonists to resist the tyranny of Britain under George III and by the French to overthrow the despotic Bourbon monarchy.

It was even applied in England by those who opposed the policy of coercing the American colonies, and, indeed, there and then was embodied in one of its most classic forms in

the speeches and writings of the great Irish orator, Edmund Burke. It would be easy to show that it was totally foreign to the thinking of the religious Revolutionaries of the 16th century and to that of their patrons and heirs—to Luther, Calvin, and Knox; to the Tudors, the Stuarts, the Bourbons, and the Hanoverians; to the persecutors who filled America with refugees; and to most of the latter who in turn drove dissenters to the interior of the new continent.

DISTORTION AND MISSTATEMENT

These are views of the "Protestant Panorama" which will not be found in the book to which reference was made in the title of this article. It is true that the authors of the volume admit some of the most telling facts upon which these views are based, but they attempt to use them to make plausible the idea presented in the sub-title. In order to show that the *Protestant Panorama* is "A Story of the Faith that Made America Free," they resort to a very wide variety of devices—suppression, distortion, exaggeration, outright misstatement, innuendo and shameless appeals to the lowest intellectual qualities of their audience—to ignorance, prejudice, bigotry, superstition and irreverence. Indeed, it is painful to think that there might exist anywhere any considerable public that would buy the book after discovering the sort of rubbish it contains, or that could

read it through without being disgusted.

Unfortunately it is only too true that a very large proportion of the English-speaking populace today is ill-equipped to resist propaganda based on false history. One of the reasons for this condition is the misuse of history by the supporters of the Revolution. We may smile at the wild distortions of the past indulged in by the followers of Joseph Stalin. But they are no wilder than those propagated by the religious Revolutionists of the 16th century and by their patrons and successors. This fact is evidenced by some of the most famous and most respected of modern historians. It should be made known to every one and repeated endlessly to every rising generation. One of the oldest safeguards of the Revolution is distortion of history.

One wonders whose axe Mr. Hall and Mr. Holisher are grinding. Though their ostensible purpose is to trace United States freedom to Protestantism, they seem to be almost as

much, if not more concerned at every step to attack the Catholic Church. Here they join hands with Stalin and his cohorts, and it is useless to pretend otherwise. If Mr. Hall and Mr. Holisher really believe that the *Protestant Panorama* is actually "A Story of the Faith that Made America Free," why are they not content to stick to their subject? It is not necessary to mention the Catholic Church in explaining why English-speaking America was populated. It was not Catholic England that drove the Puritans, the Anglicans, the Presbyterians and others to seek refuge in the New World. The only people who in those days tried to establish tolerance in what is now the United States were the Catholics of Maryland, but for them Mr. Hall and Mr. Holisher have only a sneer.

One is inevitably brought back to the question: Why was the book written and published? But its production should cause pleasure in Moscow and win from Joseph Stalin medals for its authors.

Challenge to America

Both in the American age and the Christian age which I think is already opening, American Catholics will have a gigantic role to play. Not only the world is looking to America today for strength and guidance and recuperation. The Church also is looking to America. For from America must come not only the greatest material contribution to the work of the Church's world-wide missions; but the greatest contribution in manpower and womanpower also.—*Joseph A. Breig in the FAR EAST, May, 1952.*

Catholics and the Labor Party

R. P. WALSH

Editor (English) CATHOLIC WORKER

*Reprinted from BLACKFRIARS**

FOR good or for ill there is every chance that the Labor Party will control the destiny of this country for perhaps fifty out of the next hundred years, and as it is a party that attracts strong support from a large proportion of the Catholics in this country it is important to think of the position of these Catholics within it. In the major industrial centers the majority of Catholics in the working class support Labor; indeed, it was once estimated in the columns of this review by Lord Pakenham that 80 per cent of the Catholic body voted Labor, and even if we agree that this figure is high, the percentage must still be very significant.

Unfortunately most of those Catholics with the ability to write and to project their ideas into the world of thought and of literature tend to be supporters of the Conservative Party, and they in no way represent the general opinion of the Catholic body. When one moves at what might be called the national level of Catholic Action, one finds that most of the leaders are also Conservative. No one can doubt the right of these writers

or leaders to follow the politics they hold, nor can one doubt their ability to write and their ability to give time to the leadership of the Catholic body. They accomplish a magnificent job for the Catholic community. Yet it is unfortunate that so one-sided an impression is given of the Catholic attitude towards our political parties.

It may be held that this writer is exaggerating, perhaps for the sake of effect. The facts are not easily set out without an elaborate survey and are recorded here as a considered opinion by one who mixes considerably with these leaders. Further, when in such company the conversation turns to politics, it is amazing how often the few Labor supporters present are placed on the defensive. The attitude is usually "how can a decent chap like you belong to the Labor Party?" At the same time it is regarded as something natural to support the Conservative Party. It must be added that there are probably more on the other side who cannot understand how a Catholic can support the Conservative Party,

* 34 Bloomsbury St., London, W.C. 1, England, February, 1952.

but few of these have anything like the influence of the groups referred to.

The attitude described is unfortunate because in the present stage of the development of the Labor Party there is ample evidence of the influence that Catholics can have inside the party, and it must be remembered that it is an influence on a party doctrine that is being rethought out.

It is this re-thinking of the Labor doctrine that offers such an opportunity to those with positive contributions based on sound principles. There was a time in Labor history when it tended to be taken for granted that the State was the ideal means of doing everything in the community. But this was not always so, and it is not so now. There is a strong tradition of distrust of the State that goes back to William Morris and to Proudhon, and this distrust is coming more and more to the fore today. Another tradition inside the Labor movement is the cooperative one going back to Robert Owen and to the Christian Socialists, while the syndicalist tradition is also far from being dead.

In the past year or so several books and pamphlets have appeared from the pens of Labor leaders which, taken together, show a re-

markable change from the doctrinaire Marxist attitude.¹ There is a Marxist element inside the Labor Party, and many of Marx's ideas are common property, not so much owing to their obvious soundness but because they have circulated without the opposition of other ideas.

TRAINED CATHOLICS NEEDED

At the present time the Labor Party headquarters gives every encouragement to all who wish to contribute to the working out of the traditional Labor outlook into concrete terms suitable to the present crisis. This has to be a continuous process if a party is to maintain its democratic vitality. Because this re-thinking is going along all the time, and because of the vast opportunities for discussion and debate that can be used to propagate the traditional Christian outlook on social questions, there is a grave need for trained Catholics inside the Labor Party.

At one time the Labor Party drew its force from the nonconformist bodies. No one can pay adequate tribute to the contribution that these bodies, and in particular the Methodists, made to maintain British trade unionism and Labor politics free from doctrinaire Marxism. Unfortunately for this country this source

¹ Among these publications are: *Restatement of Liberty*, Patrick Gordon-Walker, M.P. (Hutchinson, 1951); *Socialist Values in a Changing Civilization*, R. H. S. Grossman, M.P. (Fabian Society, 1951); *Small Man: Big World*, Michael Young (Labor Party, 1949); *The Just Society*, John Strachey, M.P. (Labor Party, 1951).

of Christian outlook is not as widespread as it used to be, and in many areas Labor parties exist without the great benefit of the idealism and contact with the gospels given to older parties by the lay preacher.

This loss will mean a vacuum which will be filled by the Marxist type, often a convert from Communism, unless we, who have so many assets in our Faith, in our social principles and in the large numbers of Labor supporters within our ranks, encourage those supporters to become active members of the Labor Party. It is a truism to state that Catholic Action is not concerned with party politics, but it is also a truism that is often overlooked that Catholic Action ought to be training Catholics and then encouraging them to go into other bodies, especially into political parties.

In the abstract all Catholics would agree with this attitude, but many will wonder if the Labor Party is a suitable party for young Catholics to join. After all, they will think, the Popes have condemned Socialism, and the Labor Party is Socialist. Socialism is, I fear, not a word of exact meaning today; it means very much what the user of it chooses it to mean. When you mix with ordinary Labor supporters, the term takes on a very practical meaning, at times meaning little more than security and at other times meaning nationalization of some industries.

Security is in actual fact one of the main pre-occupations of the ordinary Labor supporter. He has memories of the bad years of mass unemployment and dreads their return. It is no good telling him that no party would dare tolerate mass unemployment again; he remains unconvinced and indeed cannot see any reason why he should change his views. His fear may be illogical; it may be based on a false reading of history. Nevertheless, in the areas that suffered most from the mass unemployment of the 1930's the fear of its recurrence is very real and binds the workers closely to Labor.

Those Labor supporters who think more than the average realize that a full employment policy has snags and realize that it involves controls and state interference on a scale that our fathers and grandfathers would have called Communist. Yet he cheerfully accepts those dangers in preference to the certain hardships of a deflationary policy that would certainly lower standards of living and produce considerable unemployment in order to make the balance-of-trade position better.

Our economists are not noted for their ability to place the facts of these problems before the people in understandable language. That is one reason to welcome the publication of an essay of the famous German economic thinker, Walter Eucken, in which the deflationary method of

curing a faulty balance of trade is shown to be "a considerable fall in the standard of living and increased unemployment."²

DISTRIBUTION OF WEALTH

The next problem that will be found to interest the ordinary person is that of the distribution of wealth. When a Catholic reads the statement of the Quebec bishops: "Above all it is necessary to favor a better distribution of riches," and recalls the present Holy Father saying that the redistribution of wealth is still a central point of Catholic social doctrine, he is encouraged in his support of the Labor Party because he feels that Labor policies, especially in taxation, are working in that direction. He feels that the quotations he takes from the Popes³ are the moral justification for the practical measures carried out by Labor and those advocated by it.⁴

Indeed, to judge from statistics, no other country can boast of so much achievement in the realm of the redistribution of wealth. Of course it has meant that some, in the middle and upper middle classes in particular, have had a lower standard of living than before. Unless we are to wait until the "national cake" has

grown a lot more and to tolerate injustice in the meantime, this is bound to happen, and those who suffer can take consolation in the fact that the almost virtual abolition of extreme poverty, described in Rowntree's recent survey of York, has been possible because of the taxes they have paid.

Nationalization is a vital question, and the extent to which nationalization policies can go before becoming dangerous needs serious discussion with the aid of good thinkers who are free from a bias against any nationalization. So often such a discussion is rendered useless because so many of those who ought to be helping those of us who are in the Labor Party begin by assuming that almost every act of nationalization is immoral. But those who avoid this defect can be of great assistance, and among them must be named Father Lewis Watt, S.J., who reminds us that "it will never be possible for moralists and social economists to write *finis* to the treatise on private ownership,"⁵ recognizing the full force of Pius XI's statement that the definition of private ownership has been left to man and to man's laws.

The industries that have been listed form time to time by Catholic

² *The Unsuccessful Age*, Walter Eucken, with an introduction by Professor Jewkes (Hodge, 1951).

³ E.g. Pius XII's broadcast to Spanish workers, March, 1951.

⁴ Cf. *Toward Equality*, E. Cooper Wallis (Fabian Society, 1951).

⁵ *Nationalization: What the Pope Has Said* (C.T.S., 1948).

thinkers as being lawful objects of nationalization are many. The *Code of Social Principles* refers to "industrial, commercial or agricultural undertakings"; Dr. Lucy, Coadjutor Bishop of Cork, refers to transport, communications, hydro-electric plants, social insurance, central banks as being suitable for public ownership, and adds that a possession "which places the public at the mercy of a single individual, joint stock company, ring or cartel is of its nature unsuited for full private ownership . . . indeed, one may go further and say that all private monopolies whatever are suspect."⁶

Which is, of course, all in keeping with what Pius XI wrote in *Quadragesimo Anno*: "It is rightly contended that certain forms of property must be reserved to the State." Dr. Lucy adds to that the comment: "There is no reason to lament the passing of private monopoly in essential industries and services. Quite the contrary. Modern capitalism, with its restrictive practices and unconscionable profits, has no inviolable right to life from the Moral Law."

Such extension of State powers brings us to the problem of the State itself. To read some anti-Labor writings one would imagine that the Catholic view of the State is simply

a canonized version of the old non-interfering State beloved by so many who never needed the helping hand of the State. It seldom occurs to these writers that the State has a duty, to quote one instance, to "intervene in the sphere of labor, to regulate its division and distribution in the manner and to the extent required by the public welfare properly understood."

MUTUAL UNDERSTANDING

There is need for mutual understanding between Catholics of varied political beliefs. How real that need is can be shown from a letter received by the present writer, in his capacity as editor of the *Catholic Worker*, in which a man from a Midlands town asked for advice. He had been placed on the panel of municipal candidates by the local Labor Party and several leading figures in the parish had tackled him to show that a Catholic could not be a member of the Labor Party.

This blindness is very real, and the present writer met it personally when he stood as a candidate for the Lancashire County Council and his opponent brought in a Catholic to go round to prove that a Catholic could not be a member of the Labor Party and also be a good Catholic. Parish priests have had the same ex-

⁶ *Christus Rex*, January, 1947.

⁷ *Wealth, Work and Freedom*, Pius XII (C.T.S., 1942).

perience. They have told the writer that they have had difficulty in convincing parishioners that Catholics standing for the local council as Labor candidates were not thereby proved to be Communists. How much better would it have been if those leading parishioners had gone to the Catholic in the Midlands town and encouraged him in his new venture! It would be wrong, however, to transform this judgment into an universal one, because there are many Catholics, important in their own Conservative parties, who have encouraged the present writer at such times as he has been a labor candidate.

We need Catholic influence in all parties, and there is a duty on those who lead the Catholic body to give every encouragement to those who are prepared to learn something of Catholic social principles and, thus equipped, to go and play an active part in one or other of the political parties.

Our influence in any party can

only follow loyal and zealous service. Through such service we can win confidence and an opportunity to secure a respectful hearing for our views. On the whole Catholics are held in high esteem in the Labor Party; they are not discriminated against, as may be seen from the number who are Labor M.P.'s and Labor councillors. They secure a hearing for their views, as may be realized from the energetic action of non-Catholic Labor M.P.'s in tackling the schools question and in securing agreement from the late Labor Government to support an amending bill to give some relief.

We have a great opportunity to play the part of moral advisor to the Labor movement that the non-conformists played in the 1800's. It depends on our energy and our willingness to sacrifice our time and leisure if we seize this opportunity. If we fail, we cannot complain if in the future Labor is dominated by the doctrinaire Marxists.

Insult to Women

Under the mistaken notion that they are protecting health, financial security or a high material standard of living, the birth preventers try to persuade less intelligent women that it's all right to be partner to a marriage whose purpose is deliberately undermined. They don't know—or do they?—that when they undermine the purpose of marriage, they deny the honorable purpose of woman—and with this all her honor and dignity are gone.—*Elizabeth McMenamin in the CHRISTIAN FAMILY, May, 1952.*

Interracial Marriage

VERY REV. JOSEPH F. DOHERTY, S.T.D.

Chancellor, Camden Diocese

*Reprinted from THE PRIEST**

INTERRACIAL marriage, as its infrequency of occurrence in the United States indicates, is not a significant phase of American life. It seems true that minority racial groups are as uninterested in fostering interracial marriages as is the majority white group. It is also true that there is no important influence at work positively advocating the mixture of races by marriage. The question may be asked, why then is so much attention paid to it?

Marriage is, without doubt, the most intimate social relationship experienced by man. It has become a symbol of group solidarity: the stronghold to be guarded at any price. Thus, in one sense interracial marriage with its associated problems is the race problem. In fact, marriage generally implies a social equality of parties. When interracial marriage is permitted, a certain basic equality is admitted, but not all are ready to admit this basic equality when other races are involved.

The avenues leading to a sane and sound evaluation of the problems presented by interracial marriage have

been blocked in part by the aberrations of racism: the theory that one ethnic group is condemned by the laws of nature to hereditary inferiority and another group is marked off as hereditarily superior. Its corollary maintains that the hope of civilization is in keeping one race pure and eliminating the so-called inferior group, or keeping it segregated. The term *race* is used as the classification of large groups of mankind based on traits which are hereditary.

Free from all sympathy with racists, Holy Mother the Church, to paraphrase the words of Pope Pius XII, proclaims to all Her sons, scattered over the world, that the spirit, the teaching and the work of the Church can never be other than that which St. Paul preached: "putting on the new (man), him who is renewed unto knowledge, according to the image of Him that created him. There is neither Gentile nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, barbarian nor Scythian, bond nor free. But Christ is all and in all (Colossians, 3:10, 11).

Surely, an organization cannot

* Huntington, Indiana, April, 1952.

make such claims in the muddled world of today and then, ostrich-like, bury its head in the sands of indifference and hear no evil. The Church has never done so. Time and again she has insisted on the essential worth of man. The condemnation of racism by Pope Pius XI is only one of such insistences. Social legislation, therefore, which smacks of a condemned racist doctrine—namely, preservation of “purity of race”—is at a tremendous disadvantage in proving its claim to being just law. The Catholic Church is entirely out of sympathy with such legislation. No reasonable justification can be claimed for the deprivation, merely on the basis of difference of race, of the fundamental right to marry according to one's own choice.

Despite the fact that laws forbidding interracial marriage are in force in 29 States of the United States, one will look long and hard to find sufficient reason to justify them on any basis that is not questionable.

THE CHURCH DOES NOT FORBID SUCH MARRIAGES

The Roman Catholic Church in no wise forbids interracial marriage as such. The Apostolic See alone can establish impediments to marriage for the baptized. The Apostolic See alone authentically interprets the divine law insofar as it establishes impediments to marriage. The Univer-

sal Church, however, places no obstacle to interracial marriage. It may not be argued that since this has been mainly a local problem, it should be left to the local Church authorities to legislate upon it.

On the contrary, it must be denied that the Apostolic See or the local Ordinaries would be indifferent to moral problems in any given locality. If one will consult the acts and decrees of the Plenary Councils of Baltimore, the First Plenary Council of Latin America, the first four Provincial Councils of Quito, or the Archdiocesan Synod of Santiago in Cuba of 1680, no law will be found forbidding such marriages. These Councils and Synods are mentioned because they represent localities where the mixture of races has and does exist on a large scale.

Interracial marriage may also be considered in the light of the right to marry according to one's own choice. The right to marry the person of one's own choice means that there should be freedom to marry this particular person of one's own choice regardless of race, and, it is understood, to have children by this particular person. Its importance as a natural human right, therefore, is not to be underestimated.

There are, of course, certain obvious limits to this freedom of choice. Reason imposes many limits as does the positive divine law. Neither the natural law, however, nor divine

positive law sets up any impediment to marriage based on mere difference of race.

Morally considered, entrance upon an interracial marriage is in itself a good act. *In general*, to enter upon marriage is in itself a morally good act. Difference of color or race may be present in a particular marriage. This difference is, however, no more than an accidental concomitant. Hence, it does not change the primary moral goodness of entering upon marriage. It has been intimated above that the present writer is convinced that the laws of the various States in the United States which forbid interracial marriage are unjust. This conviction is based upon several considerations.

First, there is no equitable proportion between the good effect that may be claimed for these laws and the resulting loss of benefits to the individual and to society, stemming from the deprivation of the fundamental human right to marry the person of one's own choice. One such benefit is sacramental grace in the case of baptized persons.

Second, if the desired effect of the laws is the advantage of any one particular group (for example, the white group), this advantage is not for the *common* good. Laws demand some reference to the *common good*, not merely to the good of a particular racial group.

Third, if the effect desired is the

preservation of public order through the avoidance of racial disturbances, this would be a common good. But it is a common good that rests on such weak presumptions that it is practically baseless. There are only one or two recorded instances in the last 150 years in the United States when interracial marriage is alleged to have been the cause of racial disturbance.

These laws seem to be somewhat superfluous and exceedingly severe adjuncts to public opinion, which should be sufficient deterrent and has proved to be sufficient deterrent to such marriages. Even in States which allow them, the number of interracial marriages is insignificant.

RACE IS ACCIDENTAL

If the desired effect of these laws is claimed to be the protection of the rights of others, this is an unfounded claim. Race is not the basis of natural rights, nor can it be the basis for the deprivation of natural rights. Neither cephalic index nor pigmentary characteristics vest men with rights. Human rights are founded in the human person and his needs, not in some accidental difference among men, such as race. A person does not have rights because he is a white man, yellow man, or black man. He has rights because he is a *person*, a rational being, a spiritual as well as corporal entity with an ultimate destiny.

The free exercise of rights is necessary if man is to achieve his ultimate destiny, for the simple reason that rights are founded in the needs of the person. No whimsical nor pretended motivation of the state is sufficient reason for depriving any person or group of persons of the fundamental personal right to marry the person of his or her own choice. These laws have failed to achieve their main objective, that is, to prevent the mixture of races, but have encouraged concubinage, deprived many persons of the opportunity to enjoy the legal and property rights which would follow from the marriage contract had they been allowed to form it, and have perpetuated interracial conflict.

One reputable scientist, Herskovits, claimed that about 70 per cent of Negroes manifest mixture with whites. The great number of mulattoes in this country is evidence of liaison. Although many liaisons were perfectly lawful, legitimate marriage is not possible in the majority of States. This argues concubinage of some sort. The laws have perpetuated interracial conflict because they have implicitly denied that social equality which is the basis of marriage and all other social intercourse.

To base these laws on difference of race alone is contrary to Christian teaching on such matters. Christianity preaches the essential equality of all men. These laws forbid without a

just and proportionate reason one form of social intercourse that is a manifestation of this essential equality of all men regardless of race.

The Holy Roman Catholic Church has never prohibited her subjects from entering upon such marriages. Where legal prohibitions have existed, she has deplored them and maintained that mere difference of race alone cannot justly form the basis of such a general prohibition.

THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

At least one State has invalidated such a law. On October 28, 1948, the Supreme Court of the State of California denied the petition for rehearing of the respondent in *Perez vs. Lippold* (32 Advance California Reports 757). The majority held sections 60 and 69 of the Civil Code of the State of California prohibiting marriages between white persons and members of certain racial groups invalid, as violative of the equal protection clause of the Federal Constitution and as being too vague and uncertain to constitute a valid regulation. The petitioners in this case were both Catholics and contended that the laws interfered with the practice of their religion.

The court, although divided 4-3, held the following principles: the right to marry is the right of individuals, not of racial groups; the essence of the right to marry is freedom to join in marriage with the

person of one's own choice; a segregation statute for marriage necessarily impairs the right to marry.

In short, there is little to uphold the validity of the laws against interracial marriage. However, this is not to say that in every instance this type of marriage should be encouraged. It is true that the Church, ever a loving Mother, customarily discourages her children from contracting marriages which may involve disadvantage to the offspring, and to this end is disposed to support, within the limits of the divine law, the dispositions of the civil authorities which tend toward the attainment of this worthy purpose. There are many moral and social reasons for such an attitude. *But the Church suggests, admonishes, persuades; she does not impose or forbid.*

When two Catholics of different races desire to contract marriage and present themselves to her free from any canonical impediment, Holy Mother the Church cannot, merely by reason of the difference of race, deny her official assistance. Her sanctifying mission, and those rights which God has given and the Church recognizes

for all her children without distinction, demand this. A general and absolute prohibition of marriage, based on difference of race alone, is in opposition to her doctrine and laws.

Certain opinions have been advanced above. These opinions are not to be taken as an invitation to violate the civil laws in States where anti-miscegenation statutes are in effect. The practical application of these opinions, advanced as those of a private theologian, must be in accord with the virtues of charity and prudence. The opinions must not be understood as an unqualified advocacy of miscegenation, but merely as attempts to state the transcendence of personal rights in this particular situation.

Thus, if a case arose involving the bond of an interracial marriage in which the Catholic Church was involved, e.g., the case of a non-baptized person about to enter the Catholic Church and desiring some authoritative statement on the validity of his interracial marriage contracted in contravention of the State laws, this case should be referred to the judgment of the Holy See.



Patience

A timely illustration of heroic patience is the remark attributed to Cardinal Lavigerie with regard to the Moslems: "Before beginning to preach the Gospel among the Moslems," he said, "we must pave the way by practising Christian charity. That preparation will take perhaps a century.—THE MAGNIFICAT, February, 1952.

The Background of Rerum Novarum

REV. DR. P. McKEVITT

Editor of CHRISTUS REX

Reprinted from CHRISTUS REX*

THE more radical the evils which he sets out to uproot, the more liable is the reformer to seem inadequate. For he propounds his remedies to an audience that has its standards debased, which rarely looks to fundamentals, but which seeks relief in institutions that will be the antithesis of those under which it suffers. If the get-rich-quick capitalist be the cause of social distress, then salvation can only come, it thinks, through the extermination of the private owner and his replacement by the omniscient State. The Leviathan is no longer feared as it was in the days of absolute monarchy, for it is believed to have been tamed by the concession of the vote to the masses.

Humanism was thought safe so long as the duration of parliament was limited. It was forgotten that the place of man cannot be defined unless we determine his position in relation to the totality of creatures. This was being done by the biologists and the philosophers, but their conclusions afforded little ground for hope. Their emphasis was on the ties common to man and the whole

realm of nature. For the idealist he was a moment in the development of the all-absorbing Absolute; for the materialist he was a piece of matter that had reached a high level of organization. In either case a policy of accepting the inevitable was the only logical course.

But logic does not rule the actions of men, even of those who consider themselves emancipated from sentiment. Whatever justification they had for their conviction, the men of the nineteenth century were of the opinion that their age surpassed all others. Browning and Tennyson were not exceptionally smug; they voiced a pride in achievement that was practically universal. It required humility for the cyclist not to feel superior to his slow-moving ancestors. Besides he knew that the bicycle was only a modest beginning, giving promise of a future more and more dominated by mechanical devices. It was easy to generalize and imagine that progress would be uniform and that social life would progress to the same extent as engineering.

The world was undergoing an

* Main St., Naas, Eire, October, 1961.

unique experience. It was being swept forward by a force such as history had never dreamt of. It was natural that men should be distrustful of any tinkering with a movement to which all their hopes for a new world were bound.

NEW CONDITIONS

From Catholics, as from the others, an evaluation of the industrial civilization that was without precedent in history was needed. It was not easy for them to join in the uncritical approbation voiced by others, if for no other reason than their acceptance of the fact that the moral law must govern all human relations. But the relevant moral teaching had been elaborated under very different circumstances and its principles had to be applied to a startlingly new set of conditions. Was the corporation, for example, a specifically Catholic institution, or was it a form of organization whose usefulness ended with the adoption of new methods of production? Then there were the newer and more intangible forms of ownership to be considered. Outside the ownership of land, the traditional moralists had only a few types of partnership to examine, none of which corresponded with the more recent forms of capital accumulation.

In any period of rapid change, it

is inevitable that opinion should divide on the question of acceptance or rejection. The modernist mentality is reckless in abjuring the past; the conservative clings too tenaciously to what is relative and transitory.

In France the controversy crystallized round the Revolution. The bedside book of La Tour du Pin and de Mun was Emile Keller's *L'Encyclique du 8 Decembre, 1864 et les principes de 1789*¹. To them the Syllabus of Pius IX was no reactionary document but a direct challenge to the false principles that blocked every effort at reform. For these principles embodied that dogma of individualism which had penetrated to the very marrow of French jurisprudence. Their propaganda was too bluntly worded, for it ranked them, in the eyes of the public, with those *grands seigneurs* who sighed for a vanished order that they were almost alone in regretting. Aristocrats, they could only too plausibly be accused of aiming at the recovery of their own privileges rather than the alleviation of the burden that weighed down the masses.

Then, too, the growing distaste for monarchy was against them. They were monarchists when kings had gone out of fashion. The Bourbons or the Bonapartes may have been no less successful in their day than their popularly elected succes-

¹ *Vers un Ordre Social Chretien*. La Tour du Pin. 2nd edition. Paris, 1929, p. 4.

sors, but no matter how frequently the public may be compelled to get rid of bad governments, it no longer thinks of the old type of government. Its decision has been taken.

PRACTICAL MEASURES

But de Mun and his associates did not remain in the domain of philosophy. Their program advocated practical measures which would have swept away the individualism of the philosophers of the Revolution. There was misery in the factories and workshops for which a remedy must be found. It is difficult for us today to understand the opposition which their proposals encountered. Restrictions on the hours of work, freedom of association, protection of women in industry, are now commonplace and it is hard to see why their acceptance was so slow. Perhaps they would have come sooner in France if it were not feared by the laicist rulers of the country that this would have brought prestige to the Catholic party. It is easier to understand why the Socialists made little showing; a program of which expropriation was the central plank was coldly received by an electorate largely composed of small property holders.

Yet the general impression which we get from the history of the Catholic effort in France is one of dissension and uncertainty about the road to follow. There were fears that

the organization of the workers would end in class-war. This was felt most keenly by men like de Mun who believed in their traditional *role* of leadership. Were they to be discarded and their place taken by self-governing groups of workers? To them this seemed a continuation of that individualism which destroyed the organic constitution of society. The autonomous group would take the place of the autonomous individual. This would make the restoration of the corporation [the guild] more difficult. On the other hand, Leon Harmel favored the unions, but his judgment may have been too much influenced by his experience in the factory of Val-des-Bois, where a regime prevailed which did not meet with the approval of those who stood for the revival of the corporation. These latter considered Harmel's system too paternalistic. Perhaps they failed to appreciate the need to soften by charity the bitterness which divided the workers from their masters. With Frederick Ozanam this was a priority; the materialism of the age could only be countered by the exemplification of Christian charity in action.

Many of these difficulties were universal, but the relationship between the clergy and the laity is colored by the historical experience which each country has undergone. In France the clergy had once been isolated by the privileges they had enjoyed

and which the Revolution had swept away. The Revolution had itself been lay, and Napoleon had to take account of popular feeling when he resumed diplomatic relations with the Holy See. In this atmosphere lay movements which advocated radical if not revolutionary reforms got a somewhat uneasy reception. It was not that bishops and priests were not behind the demand for reform, but difficulties about questions of authority and responsibility easily arose. The problem could hardly take the same form in Germany, where the Catholics were in a state of siege, living, as they were, in a milieu that was hostile. In spite of Leo XIII's doctrine of Christian democracy, we can say that the relation between the two orders was not defined in a manner sufficiently precise for the age until our own day.

STATE IN ECONOMIC LIFE

One doctrinal point that caused much division arose from the diverse views on the functions of the State in economic life. The Belgian school, dominated by Charles Perin, a professor of political economy at Louvain, was less conscious of the need of intervention by the public authority. These men were more sensitive to the anti-interventionist spirit of the age and placed their hope in reform that would come indirectly through a renewal of the Christian spirit. This hope was not generally

shared. Those of a more practical turn and less respectful towards the teaching of the economists saw no means of removing the grievances under which the workers groaned, apart from legislation. Their conviction was shared by the non-Catholic reformers in England who pressed for the Factory Acts. Apart, however, from these practical considerations, those who like de Mun and La Tour du Pin advocated the restoration of the corporation required from the State statutory recognition of these bodies.

In Germany, Von Ketteler seems to have found some difficulty in coming to a decision on this question. On the one hand, there was the menace of Socialism favored by the tendency towards State direction. On the other there was the Bishop's experience as member of parliament, as parish priest and as bishop. At first, strongly impressed by the Church's success in eliminating evils like slavery by indirect action, he did not look for legislation to remedy the evils of the capitalist regime. Under Christian influence slavery had withered away though there was no explicit condemnation of the institution. Could we not hope that capitalism in its abusive form would run the same course? Yet Ketteler was primarily a man of action and he soon came to claim State intervention in favor of a shorter working day and reasonable rest from work.

Of him it might be said that his theory was formed under pressure of the need to establish a *via media* between liberalism and Socialism.

OWNERSHIP AND RESPONSIBILITY

In Austria the atmosphere was different. There were still many survivals of the medieval organization of life and it was possible to work for strengthening of what remained of the old guild structure. It was from the Austrian Feudal School that the French advocates of corporativism derived their ideas. But more fundamental for Blome, Vogel-sang and Kuefstein was the question of property. They deplored the divorce between ownership and responsibility as exemplified in the new and influential forms of capitalist ownership. They contrasted this separation with the legal unity that united the two under feudalism. This was brought home to them by the alienation of the lands of the old nobility, once land was freed from all legal restrictions as to its sale. The Jews were displacing the old landowners.

These circumstances introduced certain particularist elements into the program of the group. They were not formally anti-semitic, but it was the Jews who controlled that form of property which exercised the most potent social influence and which was most intractable to control. It was the dominance of the money

power in their own country that turned their minds to the consideration of the new force that was making itself felt in government circles everywhere. The Austrians registered more sensitively than others the international character of the new influence because they saw it operative under their own eyes. In England, on the other hand, the substitution of a capitalist political force for that formerly exercised by the feudal lords came about slowly. Moreover, it was never complete, as the landowners were also enriched by the payment of royalties and larger rents consequent on industrial expansion. No such factors intervened to save the Austrian aristocracy and their downfall was more unpalatable because their successors were popularly regarded as aliens.

Apart, however, from this special case of Austria, opposition to economic liberalism was common to nearly all of the Catholic social reformers. Modern liberals try to make out that this course was mistaken or, at least, that it went too far. Their argument seeks to show that the great classical economists never held the doctrine in the extreme forms imputed to them by the opposition.

This reasoning fails in that it conceives liberalism in too narrow a sense. In the nineteenth century it was an ideology. It was a group of presuppositions held dogmatically which provided a code of action for

legislators, statesmen and administrators. As a guide to action it occupied a position not dissimilar to Communism today. The Communist is committed to a rigid code to which all policy must conform. But the pressure of need always introduces a certain flexibility into the code and the conformity often becomes purely formal. So it was with liberalism, particularly in democratic countries, where dissent could more easily find expression. But these deviations did not make any permanent breach in the solidity of liberalism, which was reinforced by variants of the philosophy in domains other than the economic. The general attitude was against public intervention in industry, and any legislation in a contrary sense was regarded as exceptional.

Against this dominant sentiment the various groups struggled each in its own country. Something more was wanted. There was need of a body of social principles that could claim some authority as a statement of Catholic teaching. This obviously required an inventory of the characteristic institutions of the capitalist regime and their assessment from the point of view of Catholic moral teaching. The task could be accomplished only through the collaboration of experts familiar with conditions in every part of Europe. Apart from the prestige derived from its international character, the findings of such a body would serve as the basis

for supra-national action against evils that could not be effectively tackled within the realm of purely domestic politics. Capitalism had too many international ramifications to be countered or controlled by measures taken in any single country.

THE FRIBOURG UNION

It was in response to this demand that Monsignor Mermillod, afterwards Cardinal, Bishop of Geneva, founded the Union of Fribourg. This was a commission of Catholic sociologists and moralists which collated information and hammered out conclusions. Its deliberations were not published, but from 1885 till 1891 it held an annual meeting. It furnished reports, by request, to the Holy See. These were given by Leo XIII to Cardinal Zigliara, who had been entrusted with the task of preparing the great social encyclical. When the Pope received the first redaction, he found it lacking in clarity and submitted it to his secretary, Msgr. Boccati, for amendment. The second recension was finally examined and corrected by Leo and issued in 1891.

It would be difficult to exaggerate the importance of the Fribourg Union, but its labors were made much easier by the investigations and discussions that had taken place during the preceding twenty years. Winnowing out the contributions that grew out of local rather than

general conditions, it brought to the forefront certain positions that were becoming fixed in the Catholic conscience. The rights and duties attached to property, the conditions of the wage-contract and especially its freedom, the right of association and the most suitable forms of labor organization, were the principal questions reviewed. Moreover, the competence of the State is no longer in dispute; the old hesitations have gone and the positive obligation of intervention is emphasized. This reappears in the encyclical, where it is combined with a preoccupation against unduly extending the intervention of the State.

While there was no rejection in the official documents of the points advocated by the Fribourg Union, two reforms about which many of its members held strong views received only a passing mention. Most of the leading reformers were concerned about the growth in influence of the money power. This was all the more to be feared because its international character removed it in large measure from State control. In addition, the replacement of money by credit instruments made money a more intangible thing.

We might hazard a guess as to the reason for the silence of the encyclical. The change in monetary technique had come about because the increased volume of trade could not be adequately financed by the

exclusive use of currency. It is true that the power to create credit brought with it the risk of domination, but the absence of some such power would have brought about a deflationary condition that would have involved untold misery. It could hardly be said, either, that the financial position had reached stability. In this situation it was probably considered advisable to postpone a detailed pronouncement until the problems had been submitted to more intensive study.

We can be more confident in speculating on the reasons why the restoration of the corporation was not more vigorously urged. Unless the minds of men are prepared for it, any reform, however excellent, will fail in its appeal. Now at the end of the century, the liberalistic attitude still held sway over men's minds. Even the workers themselves were reluctant to accept the restraints of trade-union discipline. Naturally the dominant class, which gained from freedom, was still more unprepared for any renunciation of its liberty. In such a climate the corporation had no chance of acceptance. Moreover, the idea of the corporation was unfamiliar to most; it had been dead in the greater part of Europe for more than a hundred years. Any associations that may have lived on would be connected with monopoly power and hampering restrictions. It was only when employers and work-

ers were strongly organized that industrial peace demanded some unifying institution that would allow them to collaborate in harmony.

THE VOICE OF AUTHORITY

But any such omissions were more than compensated by the gain in authority which would now accrue to Catholic social teaching. The Catholic attitude towards the State, the wage-contract and property were clarified in so far as the industrial age needed guidance on these points. In this sense, *Rerum Novarum* was eminently a document of its time. But it was by no means an ephemeral pronouncement. For its solution of the difficulties was never purely pragmatic, but was based on the fundamental requirements of a life lived in accordance with human dignity. The directives were capable of development and were, indeed, the starting point of a social jurisprudence that is ever keeping pace with the evolution of society. Henceforth there would be a solid core of principle that would be possessed of an authority that no private speculation could claim.

Nor would this teaching be the exclusive possession of the Catholic world. The emphasis placed on freedom by the makers of the French Revolution was a form of humanism but one that soon brought disillusionment. There is a world of difference between an abstract or radi-

cal freedom and its realization within a particular social structure. The growth of the industrial system raised the question of a decent life for the masses. No theoretical philosophy could provide the solution, but it could give the lines along which it must run. The trouble was that there were conflicting freedoms and there must be someone to define their boundaries. It was by laying down these lines of demarcation that *Rerum Novarum* rendered a service that was widely availed of even outside Catholic circles.

The needs and rights of the working man were given priority over the claims of those who, having secured a competence, were amassing riches. The claim that economic laws must take precedence and that human welfare was a by-product was vigorously rejected. This assertion found lodgement in the conscience of men and the liberal stronghold came under constant fire. Whatever progress has since been attained was made possible by the acceptance of this truth. Even Socialists who turn their backs on justice and pin their faith on economics have only been able to win support because of the popular conviction that the social question is basically a moral one.

It is in the light of this last assertion that we must pass judgment on the industrial civilization. To the Socialists it was an evil way of life founded on exploitation and incap-

able of being reformed. Only its destruction and the introduction of public ownership of the means of production could satisfy the masses now entrusted with political power. The exploitation was frankly admitted and denounced by the Pope but the proposed remedy was rejected. The mode of production was not intrinsically immoral; the Christian is not *determinatus ad unum* (restricted to one) in respect of social arrangements. But any order which persistently runs counter to man's basic rights is in need of correction. Leo XIII both points out what these fundamental requirements are and the adjustments that must be made in the capitalist way of life to satisfy them. The evils castigated did not derive from mass-production, but from a gross violation of the moral law. The system must be humanized in the best sense of the word. Those who would replace it by a socialized society were putting forward a remedy that was superficial, one that violated the nature of man by thwarting all his instinct for ownership and independence.

When men are in need they often accept help from the first comer without scanning the gift. Socialism

was early in the field in competition with a reformed capitalism. The contest is still being fought and this generation may see the final battle. But whatever be the outcome, the decision will not be irrevocable. If Socialism should triumph, human nature will have its revenge. Should capitalism win, it will only be on condition that it no longer sacrifice men to production. It must cast off its heartless indifference to human misery.

But the task of balancing men's claims remains to be solved and this is mainly an ethical question. In facing this problem our generation has the advantage of having set before its eyes for sixty years the true principles of reform. Those who regret that Leo had not spoken sooner should reflect that it took all of that sixty years for the world to assimilate his teaching and it is only the tragic happenings of our recent history that are driving men to look for the better and safer way. Perhaps the Victorians were too successful to make a good audience for the reformer and he will have a better reception from their less fortunate children. If these are wiser than their fathers, the plans for rebuilding are at hand.

Catholic-Protestant tensions will probably always exist and can, we feel, be alleviated by open discussion, but only in an atmosphere of trust and mutual sincerity.—*Robert Burns in VOICE OF ST. JUDE, May, 1952.*

Editorials

Content of Catholic Magazines

OCCASIONALLY a new reader of this magazine expresses a certain amount of surprise at the subject matter of some of our articles. This reaction is not confined to readers of this magazine alone; it is common among readers of many other Catholic publications with similar editorial policies. Finding articles like the one in our last issue on America's housing problem, for instance, or the article in this issue on Senator Kefauver, confuses some people. They do not usually object to what the articles say; most people seem to find them interesting and informative enough. Apparently, however, they are surprised to find articles on non-religious subjects in a Catholic magazine. This is especially true if the articles deal with what are considered controversial subjects.

"The magazine is a religious publication," the attitude seems to be. "Why do you have articles on such subjects as housing, unions and the like? Isn't that being rather worldly? Why not stick to religion?"

Obviously there is a need for Catholic magazines which are devoted exclusively to strictly religious or de-

votional subjects, and there are many of these. Such magazines spread wider knowledge of Catholic doctrine, promote piety and help to develop a deeper love for the Church. Certainly the function of such magazines is a vital one.

At the same time, there is a great need for Catholic publications which have as one of their major purposes the *application* of Catholic teaching not only to individual moral problems, but also to such knotty questions of public policy as decent housing, slum clearance, just wages, the place of unions and similar subjects. The teachings of the Church are not intended to affect only our very personal contacts, such as our face-to-face relationships with our immediate families or next-door neighbors. Other and larger questions also involve moral problems, and application of the teachings of the Church is vital to the understanding and solution of these and similar issues.

In certain areas this point is easy to see. There is seldom any complaint, for instance, because movies are evaluated in Catholic publications from the point of view of morality as well as entertainment value. People apparently recognize that Hollywood's output has to be judged

against a moral yardstick. In similar fashion moral judgments about stage plays produce no adverse comments, and condemnation of immodesty in dress is likewise taken for granted. On such matters people accept the fact that moral judgments are in order.

When it comes to subjects like housing, however, or race relations, or just wages, or international peace, people frequently seem to slip their mental blinders on. The feeling that such subjects are somehow outside the scope of moral judgment is apparently quite general. Yet nothing could be further from the truth.

To say that morality must be applied to questions like housing, wages, labor and the like does not, of course, mean that every priest and trained layman automatically has all the answers to such complicated social questions. They do not. Such problems are very difficult to deal with. Many require not only training in the moral law but also in specialized areas such as economics or sociology or political science, and there is always a great deal of room for debate. But to say that such questions are complicated, as they admittedly are, does not mean that they are outside the scope of the moral law.

The question of wage levels, for example, is an economic problem with many technical aspects; it is also inescapably a moral problem involv-

ing the virtue of justice. The welfare of the family is intimately tied up with a very material and practical question, the presence or absence of decent housing; hence today housing is a matter of pressing concern for those who want to promote healthier family life in this country. All over the U. S., slums are eating away at the hearts of our great cities, and the presence of these areas constitutes a danger to the welfare and moral well-being of the entire community. The man who is interested in a moral, decent social order cannot ignore their presence.

On the international scene, to cry "Peace! Peace!" is not enough. As the Popes have pointed out time and time again, peace cannot be had without a solid foundation of justice, and this means that questions like iron-clad immigration barriers and rigid restrictions on access to raw materials and markets must be settled. Issues such as these are called political, and rightly so, but they also involve moral questions which cannot be ignored.

All this means that a special effort must constantly be made to apply moral law in these areas of economic, political and social life. One of the most important tasks facing the Christian today is that of making Christian principles take on shape and substance in the day-to-day customs and institutions of the modern world. To avoid controversial sub-

jects, to confine the application of moral principles only to stage, screen and beachwear, simply postpones accomplishment of that necessary task. —THE VOICE OF ST. JUDE, *Chicago, Ill.*, November, 1951.

The Pope and the Missions

THERE was a striking significance in the date that our Holy Father, Pope Pius XII, chose to issue his great encyclical on the Missions, entitled *Evangelii Praecones*, "Heralds of the Gospel." On that day, June 2, 1951, Pope Pius made one of his rare trips into the city of Rome, outside the Vatican. The occasion was his first visit to the new Church of St. Eugene, where he consecrated the main altar and celebrated the first Mass. The thoroughly modern atmosphere of St. Eugene's (named in the Pope's honor, for Eugene was his Christian name before he took the title of Pius XII) seemed to symbolize the Holy Father's keen awareness of the changing modern world, and the need for the Church to take account of new mentalities, new conditions of human life.

The following day, June 3, the people of Rome, along with visitors from every part of the world, came to the Basilica of St. Peter's, where in the morning the Papal decree was proclaimed and celebrated raising Pope Pius X, of blessed memory, to the honors of the altar. In the cool

of the evening, just as the western sun sank behind St. Peter's dome, the Pope appeared on St. Peter's steps, and spoke at length to the vast throng about the wisdom, the beauty and the holiness of his predecessor's life, using no manuscript or notes.

One great master-thought—among many which suggested themselves—linked up the beatification of Pius X with the encyclical on the Missions. This was a simple truth, remarked by many an observer of the Church's history during the past three decades. If you were to point to any single factor that has brought about the spread of the Catholic missions during this recent period—notably in countries like tropical Africa—and that has given the new Christians and the old Christians in pagan lands the heroic strength to withstand persecution and deceit, it is the spiritual light and strength derived from the reception of the Body and Blood of Christ in the holy Sacrament of the Eucharist; its early distribution to little children; its frequent, even daily reception by the faithful. But it was Pope Pius X, as his successor Pius XII so eloquently reminded his audience, who removed the barriers which had long kept the faithful from frequent and early Communion.

The encyclical defined the object of the Church's missionary activities as follows: "To bring the light of the Gospel to new races and to form

new Christians." "However," the document adds:

The ultimate goal of missionary endeavor, which should never be lost out of sight, is to establish the Church on a sound foundation among non-Christian peoples and place the Church under her own native hierarchy.

For this reason the Pope again insists upon the supreme importance of a native clergy. To show how wise is the Church in urging native clergy, and how suicidal to the interests of religion is neglect of the same, he recalls the "almost prophetic vision" of his immediate predecessor, Pope Pius XI, who warned, in his encyclical *Rerum Ecclesiae*, that a terrible disaster would befall missionary territories if some day missionaries belonging to a foreign power were to be driven out of them. The loss would be irreparable unless there were a native clergy to take their place.

The encyclical, too, put into high relief the need of joining a program of far-reaching social reforms to the purely supernatural message of the Church. Warning against the annihilation by Communism of all human dignity, the Pope likewise warned against a state of economic servitude which would deprive workers of their natural rights. "Whether this servitude arises from the exploitation of private capital," he said, "or from state absolutism, the result is the same."

The days are past when we could

look upon the missions as something remote from our daily life. The issues raised by the Pope, with their bearing on the full dignity of every member of the Church, regardless of race or color, as well as with their insistence upon full social justice, affect every parish in the United States. On the other hand, each one of us who actively supports the missions—whether by personal work or by gifts—is hastening the day when all men and all peoples shall be one in Christ, and shall live as brothers upon the face of the globe.—INTER-RACIAL REVIEW, New York, N. Y., July, 1951.

More Than Snobbery

THE nation was shocked last December when the Negro educator, Harry T. Moore, was bombed to death in Florida by some apostles of white supremacy.

The same kind of prejudice that passed the death sentence against Mr. Moore was evident in Dayton last week. When a young man tried to buy a house in one of the city's more fashionable suburbs, the real estate company with which he was dealing said he would not be permitted to complete the purchase until his prospective neighbors agreed to his presence among them. When he presented himself for their approval, they did not take long to decide to vote against him.

They did not look at his soul;

they did not investigate whether he had a police record; they did not ask him whether he was honest and peace-loving. They took one look at the color of his skin and the arrangement of his features and noted with horror that his skin had a tint different from their own and that his eyes tilted slightly upward at the corners. They made up their minds immediately: He was not fit to live among them. He was a Chinese, a "foreigner."

The man is an American citizen; he is well educated, having attended colleges in China and the United States; his past record is honorable; he professes Christianity. But he is cursed with the misfortune of being a foreigner in his own country.

It would be small comfort to him to realize that the same persons who called him a foreigner very likely would pin the same tag on an American Indian who tried to reside among them. For such people, a foreigner is anyone different from them and, therefore, inferior.

This kind of narrowness exists in most American cities. And it is found among people of every religious belief—including Catholics. They try to justify their restrictive covenants on the ground that they must protect their property from the influx of "elements" who would depress its value by their very presence. They point out, with a solemn air of right-

eousness that apparently deceives even their own consciences, that they have a right and even a duty to exclude from their neighborhood anyone who would endanger its high standards.

If they were honest with themselves, they would find that in almost every case their underlying motive is a blind and unreasoning prejudice. People will often tolerate the most obnoxious neighbors of their own race while objecting fiercely to others whose only "fault" is the color of their skin or the nationality of their ancestors.

Under some circumstances, residents of a given district may have sound reasons for maintaining a degree of exclusiveness in their neighborhood. They have a moral right, for example, to agree not to sell their property to an industry whose presence might jeopardize property values. But there is little excuse for the snobbery of those who accept as neighbors only those whose names are in the social register. And race prejudice is a considerably greater evil than snobbery. We can conceive of no circumstance that would make it morally right for a group to exclude a prospective neighbor solely because of his race. Such conduct is against every principle we hold as Americans and as Christians.—CATHOLIC TELEGRAPH-REGISTER, Cincinnati, Ohio, March 7, 1952.

Documentation

On Educating Youth

POPE PIUS XII

An apostolic exhortation to the first International Congress of Teaching Sisters, September 15, 1951.

WE PARTICULARLY welcome the occasion offered by your presence at the Congress of Teaching Sisters to express Our heartfelt and paternal praise for the activities of Sisters in the school and in education both in Italy and throughout the Catholic world. How could the Church have fulfilled her mission of education and charity during these last few years, especially in the immediate past, without the aid given by hundreds of thousands of Sisters with so much zeal? How otherwise could the Church fulfil her mission today?

No doubt, there are many other useful and energetic women working with or beside nuns or dedicating themselves to the apostolate of the laity. We have in mind especially the good Catholic women teachers in the State schools. But they must not wonder if, today, We turn to you, beloved daughters, gathered around Us as representatives of the religious orders and congregations devoted to the apostolate of the school and education. May the dedication, love and sacrifices that more often than not you bear in obscurity for the love of Christ and the benefit of young people bring forth fruit a hundredfold in the future as they did in the past. May Our Lord reward you and shower upon you the abundance of His Divine favors.

We hope all the more fervently that this may be so because with you We are aware of the crisis through which your schools and educational institutions are passing. It is a question of the youth of today and convent schools. In your congress you have doubtlessly had the opportunity of treating this subject fully. Many points concerning you no less than priests and Brothers in religious orders have already been discussed by Us in Our address of December 8, 1950. For this reason, We can confine Ourselves now to those aspects of your problem which, in Our opinion, need more consideration.

I

Lack of Understanding

If it be your painful experience that the teaching Sister and the modern girl no longer understand each other, well, this is not a thing peculiar to you. Other teachers, often parents themselves, are not in a very much better position. It is not using empty words to say that young people have changed,

become very different perhaps. The chief reason for this difference in the young people of today may be that which forms the subject of the frequent lament: young people are irreverent toward many things that formerly from childhood were naturally regarded with the greatest respect. But young people of today are not solely to be blamed for their present attitude. In childhood, they have lived through horrible things and they have seen many ideals formerly held in high esteem fail and fall miserably before their eyes. For this reason they now mistrust and reject them.

It must be remembered also that this complaint about lack of understanding is not something new. It is one made in every generation and it is mutual between maturity and youth, parents and children, teachers and pupils. Half a century ago and even a little more, there was a good deal of sentimentality. People were fond of believing that they were "misunderstood" and said so. Today, the complaint, not devoid of a certain amount of pride, is more concerned with the intellect. The result of this misunderstanding is, on the one hand, a reaction which may sometimes exceed the limit of justice, a tendency to repudiate anything that is, or appears to be, new, an exaggerated suspicion of rebellion against any tradition. On the other hand, it is a lack of faith that shrinks from all authority and, spurning every competent judgment, seeks solutions and counsels with a sort of infatuation more ingenuous than reasoned.

To try to reform young people and convince them by exacting submission, to persuade them by force, would be useless and not always right. You will induce them very much better to give you their trust if you, on your side, strive to understand them and to make them understand themselves—save always in the case of those immutable truths and values which admit of no change in the heart and mind of man.

Understanding young people certainly does not mean approving and admitting everything they maintain in their ideas, their tastes, their caprices, their false enthusiasm. It consists fundamentally in finding out what is solid in them and accepting this trustfully without remorse or anger; in discovering the origin of their deviations and errors, which are often nothing but the unhappy attempt to solve real and difficult problems; and, finally, in following closely the vicissitudes and conditions of the present time.

Making yourself understood does not mean adopting abuses, inaccuracies, confused ideas, modern expressions ambiguous in syntax, or the words themselves. It rather means expressing clearly one's own thoughts in different yet always correct ways, striving to fathom the thoughts of others, always keeping in mind their difficulties, their ignorance and their inexperience.

On the other hand, it is also true that young people of today are fully capable of appreciating true and genuine values. And it is precisely at this point that you must assume your responsibility. You must treat young people with the same simplicity and naturalness you show among yourselves; you must treat them according to their character. At the same time, you must all show that spiritual seriousness and reserve which even the world of today expects from you, that spiritual seriousness and reserve through which it must sense your union with God. When you are with young people, it is not necessary to speak continually of God. But when you do so, you must speak in a

way to command their attention: with genuine feeling arising from profound conviction. In this way, you will win the confidence of your pupils, who will then allow themselves to be persuaded and guided by you.

II

The Religious Life

And now We come to that which concerns you particularly: the religious life, your habit, the vow of chastity, your rules and constitutions. Do these render you less fit or downright incapable where the instruction and education of today's young people are concerned?

In the first place, We say that those who have the (primary) right in education, the parents, are not of this opinion. Sisters' schools are still sought after and preferred even by many people who care little or nothing for religion. In many countries, vocations to the life of a teaching Sister and the number of Sisters' schools are much below the demand. This does not happen through mere chance. Therefore, we may add—and not only in regard to Italy but speaking in general—from those who have a part in drawing up school legislation, we must expect that determination for justice, that democratic sense, so to speak, which corresponds to the will of the parents, in such a way that the schools founded and directed by religious institutes be not placed in a worse condition than the State schools, and that they be given the freedom which is necessary for their development.

And now, let us briefly discuss the religious life in itself. The religious habit: choose it in such a way that it becomes the expression of inward naturalness, of simplicity and spiritual modesty. Thus it will edify everyone, even modern young people.

Chastity and virginity (which imply also the inner renunciation of all sensual affection) do not estrange souls from this world. They rather awaken and develop the energies needed for wider and higher offices beyond the limits of individual families. Today there are many teaching and nursing Sisters who, in the best sense of the word, are nearer to life than the average person in the world.

Followed in letter and spirit, your constitutions, too, facilitate and bring the Sister all she needs and must do in our time to be a good teacher and educator. This also applies to purely mechanical matters. In many countries today, for example, even Sisters use bicycles when their work demands it. At first this was something entirely new, though not against the Rule. It is possible that some details of the school schedules, certain regulations—simple applications of the Rule—certain customs which were, perhaps, in harmony with past conditions but which today merely hinder educational work, must be adapted to new circumstances. Let superiors and the general Chapters proceed in this matter conscientiously, with foresight, prudence and courage and, where the case demands, let them not fail to submit the proposed changes to the competent ecclesiastical authorities.

You wish to serve the cause of Jesus Christ and of His Church in the way the world of today demands. Therefore, it would not be reasonable to persist in customs and forms that hinder this service or perhaps render it impossible.

Sisters who are teachers and educators must be so ready and so up to the level of their office, they must be so well versed in all with which young people are in contact, in all which influences them, that their pupils will not hesitate to say: "We can approach the Sister with our problems and difficulties; she understands and helps us."

III

The School and Education

In this way, We come now to the needs of the school and education, which We particularly wish to recommend to your care.

Many of your schools are being described and praised to Us as being very good. But not all. It is Our fervent wish that all endeavor to become excellent.

This presupposes that your teaching Sisters are masters of the subjects they expound. See to it, therefore, that they are well trained and that their education corresponds in quality and academic degrees to that demanded by the State. Be generous in giving them all they need, especially where books are concerned, so that they may continue their studies and thus offer young people a rich and solid harvest of knowledge. This is in keeping with the Catholic idea, which gratefully welcomes all that is naturally good, beautiful and true, because it is an image of the Divine goodness and beauty and truth.

Most parents entrust their daughters to you because their consciences bid them do so. But this does not mean that the children should suffer by receiving in your schools an education of inferior value. On the contrary, you must do all you can to assure parents that their children are getting the best education right from the elementary classes.

And then, do not forget that knowledge and good teaching win the respect and consideration of the pupils for the teaching Sister. Thus she can exercise a greater influence on their character and their spiritual life.

In this respect, there is no need for Us to repeat that which you know well, that which has certainly been the object of ample discussion during your Congress. According to the Catholic concept, the object of the school and of education is the formation of the perfect Christian, that is—to apply this principle to your conditions—to exercise such spiritual and moral influence and to so accustom girls and young women that when they are left to themselves they will remain firm in their faith as Catholics and put this faith into daily practice. At least, there must be the well-founded hope that the pupil will later on lead her life according to the principles and rules of her faith.

Your entire school and educational system would be useless were this object not the central point of your labor. Our Lord wants you to strive toward this aim with all your strength. He has called you to the vocation of educating girls and making them perfect Christians. In this He demands your complete dedication, and one day He will ask you to render an account.

The modern girl! You can measure better than many others the still unsolved problems and the grave dangers resulting from recent changes in the woman's world from her sudden introduction into all walks of public life. Was there ever such a time as the present, when a girl has to

be won and trained interiorly, according to her convictions and will, for Christ's cause and a virtuous life, remaining faithful to both despite all temptations and obstacles, beginning with modesty in dress and ending with the most serious and anguishing problems of life?

Let it never happen that material advantages, personal authority, wealth, political power or similar considerations induce you to renounce your educational ideals and betray your vocation! An examination of conscience during your Congress may have salutary effects. This paternal exhortation is motivated solely by Our benevolence for you, because your cares are Ours also, your happy success is Ours, too.

In obtaining favorable results, harmony and generous accord between the different religious families can play a big part. Mutual knowledge and encouragement, holy emulation can be but to your mutual advantage. The most encouraging steps have already been taken in this respect. All you have to do is to continue them.

Like Christian education in general, which today is not an objective easily to be achieved, your mission is not an easy one. But regarding the inner formation of the young girl, your religious vocation is a powerful ally. Living faith, union with God, the love of Christ, with which each of you has had the chance to fill herself in the spirit of the Congregation from the first day of the novitiate; the vow, not only of chastity, but especially that of obedience; a common task under one guidance in the same direction—all these things act strongly on young minds, always supposing, of course, that you live up to your vocation.

May Divine Providence direct and lead you in all that you propose and undertake. May the grace of Our Lord Jesus Christ fill your minds and hearts. May the Blessed Virgin, Mary our Mother, be your model, protectress and advocate. Together with the expression of these wishes, We most cordially impart Our Apostolic Blessing to you, beloved Sisters, and to all the young people entrusted to your care.

To the Faithful of Rome

POPE PIUS XII

Exhortation of His Holiness, February 10, 1952

THIS fatherly exhortation, beloved sons and daughters of Rome, comes to you from Our heart—from Our heart which is troubled on the one hand over the prolongation, without any definitive clarification, of the dangerous situation of the world around us, and on the other, by a far too widespread listlessness which prevents many from undertaking that return to Jesus Christ, the Church and the Christian way of life which We have often singled out as the decisive remedy for the universal crisis agitating the world. But the confidence that We shall find in you the comfort of understanding, as well as determined readiness for action, has moved Us to open Our heart to you. Today, give heed to a rousing call from the lips of your Father and Shepherd, from Us who cannot remain mute and inert

before a world which is unconsciously walking paths which sweep on to ruin both souls and bodies, the good and the wicked, civilization and peoples. The realization of Our responsibility before God obliges Us to attempt everything, to undertake everything, in order to spare the human race so frightful a disaster.

To share with you these anxieties of Ours, We have chosen the eve of tomorrow's feast of the Virgin of Lourdes, because it commemorates the miraculous apparitions which, almost a hundred years ago, in that century of rationalistic aberration and religious depression, were the merciful answer of God and His Heavenly Mother to the rebellion of men, an irresistible summons back to the supernatural, and the first step towards a progressive religious renaissance. And what Christian heart, no matter how lukewarm and thoughtless, could resist the voice of Mary? Certainly not the hearts of Romans, not the hearts of you who, along with the faith of the martyrs, have inherited, as a legacy handed down through long centuries, a spirit of filial affection for Mary, invoked under venerable images inscribed in stone bearing such eloquent and loving titles as "*Salus Populi Romani*," "*Portus Romanæ Securitatis*," and the more recent one of "Mother of Divine Love." All of these titles are monuments to a constant devotion to Mary and, in an even truer sense, are sweet echoes of a history of proven interventions of the Virgin in public calamities which shook the ancient walls of this city of Rome, always preserved intact through her power.

ROAD TO RUIN

Now you are aware that the dangers at present threatening this generation are much more widespread and grave than pestilence and the convulsions of nature, even though their continuing threat has begun to make the nations almost insensible and apathetic. Might not this, perhaps, be the most unfortunate symptom of the interminable and undiminished crisis which strikes fear into minds which face reality? Therefore, having had recourse once again to the goodness of God and the mercy of Mary, each one of the faithful and every man of good will must re-examine, with a courage worthy of the great moments of human history, what he can and must do personally, as his own contribution to the saving power of God, in order to help a world which is started, as it is today, on the road to ruin.

The persistence of a general condition which, We do not hesitate to say, may explode at any moment, and whose origin is to be sought in the religious lukewarmness of so many, in the low moral tone of public and private life, in systematic efforts to poison simple minds, to which poison is given after their understanding of true liberty has, so to speak, been drugged—all this cannot leave good men motionless where they are, listless spectators of an onrushing future.

Even the Holy Year, which brought on a prodigious flowering of Christian life, unfolding first in your midst and then spreading out over the entire world, should not be regarded merely as a brilliant but fleeting meteor, nor as a momentary obligation long since fulfilled. Rather should it be viewed as a first promising step towards the complete restoration of the spirit of the Gospel which, in addition to snatching millions of souls

from eternal ruin, is the only thing that can assure the peaceful co-existence and fruitful collaboration of peoples.

Now is the time, beloved children! Now is the time to take decisive steps and shake off this fatal lethargy! It is time for all good men, for all who are concerned over the destinies of the world, to recognize one another and tighten their ranks. It is time to repeat with the Apostle: "*Hora est jam nos de somno surgere*" (It is time we rise from sleep, for our salvation is nigh!) (Rom. 13, 11).

It is an entire world which must be rebuilt from its foundations, transformed from savage to human, from human to divine, that is to say, according to the heart of God. Millions of men are pleading for a change of course, as they look towards the Church of Christ as to the only strong pilot who, with all due respect for human liberty, can take the lead in so vast an undertaking. Her guidance is asked with explicit words and, even more, through tears which have been shed, through wounds still smarting, while men point to the endless cemeteries which organized and militant hate has spread over the continents.

A RE-AWAKENING

How could We, placed by God, despite Our unworthiness, as a torch in the darkness, as the salt of the earth, and as Shepherd of the Christian Flock, refuse to accept this saving mission? Just as, on a day now long passed, and because such was God's will, We accepted the heavy cross of the Pontificate, so also do We now bow to the arduous duty of being, in so far as Our weak strength permits, the herald of a better world willed by God, and whose standard We yearn to pass on first of all to you, beloved children of Rome, to you who are nearest to Us, who are entrusted in a more special manner to Our care, and who by that very fact are also set up as flaming lights on a candelabra, as a leaven among your brethren, and a city built on a mountain—to you, from whom others rightfully expect greater courage and more generous readiness for action. Receive with a noble spirit of dedication, recognizing it as a call from God and as a worthy rule of life, the holy charge which your Shepherd and Father today entrusts to you: to launch a mighty re-awakening of thought and action.

This re-awakening is a duty for everyone without exception—clergy and people, those in authority, families, groups, individuals—along the entire front of the complete renewal of Christian life, along the line of the defense of moral values, in the realization of social justice, in the reconstruction of the Christian order, in such a way that the outward face of the city of Rome, which since the Apostolic times has been the center of the Church, may soon shine forth brilliant with holiness and beauty.

May this City, upon which every age has imprinted its mark of glorious achievements, since become the heritage of all peoples, receive from this age and from her own inhabitants the crowning glory of being the promoter of the common salvation at a time when opposing forces are contending for the world. Such is what Christian peoples look for from her, and above all they await action.

This is not the moment to discuss, to search for new principles, to fix

new aims and goals. Both the one and the other, already known and substantially verified, because taught by Christ Himself, clarified by the teachings of the Church down through the centuries, adapted to immediate circumstances by the late Supreme Pontiffs, await one thing only—concrete execution.

Of what use would it be to study the ways of God and of the spirit, if in practice one were to choose the way of perdition and to submit supinely to the goad of the flesh? What would it avail to know and to proclaim that God is Our Father and that men are brothers, if every intervention of God in private and public affairs were to be feared? Of what value would be disputations on justice, on charity, on peace, if the will were already resolved to flee sacrifice, if the heart were determined to remain in icy solitude and if none were to dare to be the first to break through the barrier of dividing hate to hasten to offer a sincere embrace? All this would but render more guilty the sons of light, to whom less will be forgiven, if they have loved less. It was not with such disunity and inertia that the Church in its very beginning changed the face of the earth, spread rapidly, endured beneficent down the centuries and gained the admiration and trust of all peoples.

Let it be very clear, beloved sons, that the root of modern evils and of their baneful consequences is not, as in pre-Christian times or in regions yet pagan, invincible ignorance of the eternal destiny of man and of the principal means of attaining it; rather is it lethargy of the spirit, weakness of the will and coldness of the heart. Men, infected by such contagion, try, as if in justification, to cloak themselves with the darkness of the past and seek an alibi in errors, both old and new. It is necessary, therefore, to act upon their wills.

May the action to which We call the pastors and the faithful today reflect that of God: may it be illuminating and unifying, generous and loving. For this purpose, then, facing up to the actual state of your and Our City, make sure that the needs are well defined, that the objectives are clear, that the available forces are well calculated, so that the present initial resources are not neglected because unknown, nor haphazardly employed, nor squandered in secondary activities. Let those of good will be invited; let them offer themselves spontaneously. Let their law be that of unconditional fealty to the person of Jesus Christ and to His teachings. Let their offering of themselves be humble and obedient; let their labor enter as an active element into the great current which God shall set in motion and direct through His ministers.

For this purpose We invite Our Venerable Brother, the Cardinal Vicar, to assume the supreme direction of this regenerating and saving action in the Diocese of Rome. We are certain that there will not be lacking, either in numbers or quality, generous hearts who shall hasten to Our call and put into action Our earnest desire. There are ardent souls who anxiously await this call; to their impatient desire point out the vast fields that must be tilled. Others are fast asleep; they must be awakened. Others are apprehensive; they must be encouraged. Others are confused; they must be guided. All are called to a suitable assignment, to an appropriate service,

to a measure of work corresponding to the urgent necessity of defense, of victory, of positive construction.

Thus Rome shall relive her century-old mission of spiritual teacher of peoples, not merely, as it was and is, by reason of the Chair of truth which God has established in her midst, but by the example of her people, once again fervent in faith, exemplary in morals, one in the fulfillment of religious and civil duties and, if it please the Lord, prosperous and happy. We sincerely hope that this mighty awakening, to which We today exhort you, fostered without delay and tenaciously executed according to the pattern marked out, which others can develop in detail, shall be immediately imitated in other dioceses, near and far, so that Our eyes shall see not only cities, but nations, continents, the entire human race return to Christ.

Let the hand, then, be put to the plough: may God, Who desires it so much, move you; may the nobility of the undertaking attract you; may its urgency stimulate you; may the justifiable fear of the terrible future which would result from a culpable indolence vanquish every hesitation and steel every will.

The prayers of the humble and the little ones, objects of your most tender solicitude, the sufferings accepted and offered by the afflicted, shall support you. The example and the intercession of the Martyrs and Saints, who consecrated this soil, shall fructify your endeavors. The Most Holy Virgin will bless and multiply the happy result for which We ardently pray. We have no doubt but that She, who at all times was ever ready to extend a protective hand over her people of Rome, will, in these days, make felt her maternal protection for those sons who showed such affectionate devotion during her recent glorification, and whose loud hosannas still resound in this sky of Rome.

Finally may the Paternal Apostolic Benediction be a comfort and a support to you—a blessing which We impart with overflowing tenderness of soul to all of you who hear Us, to your families, to your labors and to this eternal City, whose faith, from the time of the Apostle, has been proclaimed in the whole world (Rom. 1, 8) and whose Christian greatness, beacon of truth, of love and of peace, shines through the centuries. Amen!

THE CATHOLIC MIND

EDITOR: Robert C. Hartnett EXECUTIVE EDITOR: Benjamin L. Masse

With the collaboration of the *AMERICA* staff

EDITORIAL OFFICE: 329 West 108th St., New York 25, N. Y.

BUSINESS MANAGER: Joseph C. Mulhern

BUSINESS OFFICE: 70 East 45th St., New York 17, N. Y.